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INTRODUCTORY NOTE

THE present volume (the third) of the Catalogue of Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library deals with the hitherto unexplored portions of the Rylands collection of papyri.

The history of the collection dates back to the time when Bernard P. Grenfell and his friend, and fellow Queen's man, Arthur S. Hunt, between 1895 and 1907, made a number of joint expeditions to Egypt, where among towns in the Fayûm, at Oxyrhynchus, and elsewhere, they were successful in making a number of most important finds.

It was during these joint expeditions that the nucleus of this collection was formed, at first for the Earl of Crawford, and after the acquisition, in 1901, of the Crawford Manuscripts for the Rylands Library, for the Governors of that institution.

The library's indebtedness to these two young scholars was further increased by their undertaking to prepare a catalogue of the collection. Unfortunately, ill-health and the pressure of other claims upon his time prevented Dr. Grenfell from taking any active part in this work, which consequently devolved upon Dr. Hunt.

The first volume of the resulting catalogue, which dealt with the literary texts, made its appearance in 1911. This was followed in 1915 by the second volume, devoted to documents of the Ptolemaic and Roman period, the preparation and publication of which was carried out by Dr. John Johnson (the present Printer to the University of Oxford), Dr. Victor Martin of Geneva, and Dr. A. S. Hunt.

Arrangements were made for the publication of the remaining portion of the collection, consisting of documents of the Byzantine period, which also included a further batch of fragments acquired in 1920 by Dr. Grenfell. This was to form the third volume of the Catalogue, to be undertaken by Dr. Hunt, but by his untimely death in 1934, the library was deprived of his services, even before he had done more than a little preliminary sorting.

It was fortunate that just before his death, Dr. Hunt had arranged with the present editor, Mr. C. H. Roberts, Fellow of St. John's College, to take over the work of preparing for publication the remainder of the Rylands collection, which in addition to the Grenfell-Hunt papyri included a further collection obtained by Dr. Rendel Harris during an enforced sojourn in Egypt, between November 1916 and May 1917, which were at once acquired by the Governors of the Library, although they were wisely left in safe custody in Egypt until such time as they could be transported to England without risk, and that was not possible until 1919.

It was in the process of sorting over the residue of the collection that Mr. Roberts found the Grenfell purchases to contain some extremely interesting papyri, including a number of literary texts, and a fragment of St. John's Gospel, which proved to be the earliest known fragment of the New Testament, and probably the earliest witness to the existence of the Gospel according to St. John.
Of such outstanding importance was this discovery regarded, that its publication in the *Catalogue* was anticipated by making the text available to scholars without delay by means of a special monograph prepared by Mr. Roberts.

Furthermore, in the course of a hurried examination of the Rendel Harris finds, another sensational discovery was made by Mr. Roberts of fragments of a papyrus roll of the Book of Deuteronomy in the Greek Version of the Septuagint, without doubt of the second century B.C., in other words three hundred years earlier than any other known MS. of the Bible in any language. This, also, is dealt with in the present volume of the catalogue, but it has been published in a separate monograph, edited by Mr. Roberts, uniform with the St. John fragment. So many biblical, theological, and literary fragments have been found amongst the unpublished fragments, that the third volume has been devoted exclusively to them, and a fourth volume has been planned in which the non-literary documents of the Ptolemaic, Roman and Byzantine periods, ranging in date from the third century B.C. to the sixth century A.D., will be dealt with.

For the difficult task of deciphering and describing the papyri dealt with in the following pages the Governors were fortunate in being able to secure the services of so competent a scholar as Mr. Roberts, and they desire to offer to him not only their most grateful thanks, but at the same time to congratulate him upon the masterly way in which he has presented the palaeographical and textual results of his investigations to our readers.

In concluding this note the writer desires on behalf of the Governors to acknowledge their indebtedness to Dr. Johnson, the Printer to the University of Oxford, and his staff for the interest and unremitting care they have bestowed upon the production of this volume.

HENRY GUPPY.

*The John Rylands Library, Manchester.*

*March, 1938.*
THE twenty-three years that have elapsed between the publication of this volume and that of its predecessor have seen the accession to the Library of two important collections of papyri, the miscellaneous collection acquired in 1917 and that bought for the Library by the late B. P. Grenfell in 1920. The present volume contains all the theological and literary texts from those collections (with the exception of two which are being held over for Volume IV) besides a few which formed part of the original purchase and were overlooked when Volume I was in preparation; of the ninety-five texts in this volume only three, 457, 458, and 460 have been previously published. The fourth and final volume of the catalogue, work on which is already in progress, will include the early Byzantine archive, originally destined by Hunt for Volume III, together with the documents of the Ptolemaic, Roman, and Byzantine periods acquired in 1917 and 1920.

The provenance of the great majority of the papyri in this volume is uncertain; a number of those purchased in 1920 were said to come either from the Fayûm or from Oxyrhynchus. In each case the date of acquisition is given at the head of the text, since it is hoped that this may provide a clue, however small, whereby other fragments of these texts, if there are any, may be traced. It is worth noting that other fragments of no less than seven texts included in this volume—in some cases actual joins can be established—have found their way into collections as far apart as Warsaw and Milan; and there may well be other coincidences which have escaped my notice.

The contents of this volume are even more heterogeneous than is usually the case with miscellaneous collections of papyri acquired by different persons at different times; in particular, attention may be drawn to the number of Latin texts included. If this volume does not contain more faults both of omission and commission than it does at present, this is due to the kindness of a number of scholars whom I have had the good fortune to consult on matters outside my knowledge and whose generous assistance is acknowledged in connexion with the individual texts. I must, however, express my thanks here to Professor F. de Zulueta, who gave me indispensable assistance with the legal texts, and to Mr. E. Lobel, whom I have frequently consulted on difficulties of interpretation and palaeography; but responsibility for any errors is the editor’s alone. To Mr. T. C. Skeat I am indebted for several corrections made in proof, and to the Rylands Librarian for giving me every facility and encouragement in preparing this volume.

ST. JOHN’S COLLEGE, OXFORD.

C. H. ROBERTS.

December, 1937.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Papyri</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>457. St. John's Gospel xviii</td>
<td>First half of second century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>458. Deuteronomy xxiii–xxviii</td>
<td>Second century B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>459. Isaiah xxi, xxii</td>
<td>Fifth to sixth century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460. Fragment of a Testimony Book</td>
<td>Fourth century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461. Psalms iii and lxxii</td>
<td>Sixth century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462. Psalms cxlviii–cl</td>
<td>Sixth to seventh century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463. The Gospel of Mary</td>
<td>Early third century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464. [Apocryphal Gospel (?)]</td>
<td>Third century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465. Liturgy of St. Mark</td>
<td>Sixth century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466. Two Byzantine Hymns</td>
<td>Seventh century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467. Liturgical Fragment</td>
<td>Sixth century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468. Liturgical Fragment</td>
<td>Sixth century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>469. Epistle against the Manichees</td>
<td>Late third century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471. Christian Amulet</td>
<td>Fifth century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472. Latin Liturgical Fragment</td>
<td>Third to fourth century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473. Sallust, <em>Histories</em></td>
<td>Second to third century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474. Latin Juristic Fragments</td>
<td>Fourth century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475. Graeco-Latin Juristic Fragments</td>
<td>Fifth century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476. Register of <em>Constitutiones</em></td>
<td>Fourth to fifth century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477. Cicero, <em>Divinatio in Q. Caecilium</em></td>
<td>Fifth century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479. <em>Digest XXX</em></td>
<td>Sixth century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480-1. Minor Fragments (Latin)</td>
<td>Fifth century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>482. Fragment of a Tragedy</td>
<td>Second century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>483. Fragment of Old Comedy</td>
<td>Second century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>484. Fragment of a Comedy</td>
<td>Late first to second century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486. Epyllion on Hero and Leander</td>
<td>Late first century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487. Epic Fragment</td>
<td>Late third to fourth century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>488. Fragment of an Anthology</td>
<td>Second century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489. Lysias, <em>Τνερ τοι ήΡατοσθενέως φώνος</em> and <em>Τνερ ήΡέντγαλκον</em></td>
<td>Late third to fourth century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490. Anonymi <em>Philippica</em></td>
<td>Third century B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491. Fragment on the Second Punic War</td>
<td>Second century B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492. Historical Fragment</td>
<td>Fifth century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493. Aesop (?), Fables</td>
<td>First century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494-500. Miscellaneous Fragments (Verse)</td>
<td>Second century B.C. to third century A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papyri</td>
<td>Title &amp; Authors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-21</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Fragments (Prose)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>Ptolemy, Επιστήμων Πόλεων Κανών</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>Astronomical Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>Astronomical Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>Mathematical Treatise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>Mathematical Fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
<td>Astrological Treatise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508</td>
<td>Astrological Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509</td>
<td>Treatise on Surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>Medical Aphorisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>Medical Receipts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>Harpocration, Λέξεις τῶν Δέκα Ρητόρων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513</td>
<td>Grammatical Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514</td>
<td>Grammatical Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>Grammatical Fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516</td>
<td>Lexicon to Homer, Iliad XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517</td>
<td>Word-List to Homer, Iliad V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518</td>
<td>Metrological Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519</td>
<td>Homer, Iliad I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>Homer, Iliad II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521</td>
<td>Homer, Iliad II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>Homer, Iliad II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523</td>
<td>Homer, Iliad V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>Homer, Iliad XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>Homer, Iliad XXIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526</td>
<td>Homer, Odyssey IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
<td>Homer, Odyssey XXIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>Euripides, Phoenissae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>Thucydides II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530</td>
<td>Xenophon, Cyropaedia VII, ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531</td>
<td>[Demosthenes], Κατὰ Θεωκρίτου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>Lycurgus, Κατὰ Δευκράτους</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE ON THE METHOD OF PUBLICATION AND
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The texts contained in this volume are printed as they stand in the originals, except for
division of words, addition of capital initials in proper names, expansion of abbreviations and
occasional supplements of lacunae. In the case of three texts, 473, 482, and 484, a reconstruc-
tion in modern form is given side by side with an exact transcription; accents and punctuation
have been inserted in 489 in order to preserve conformity with the London fragment with
which it is connected. For the treatment of additions, corrections, and scholia, the reader is
referred to the introductions to the separate texts. Square brackets [ ] indicate a lacuna, round
brackets ( ) the resolution of a symbol or abbreviation, angular brackets < > a mistaken omission
in the original, braces { } a superfluous letter or letters, double square brackets [ ] a deletion,
dashes ‘ ’ letters written above the line. Dots within brackets represent approximately the
number of letters lost or deleted; dots outside brackets indicate mutilated or otherwise illegible
letters. Letters with dots under them are to be regarded as doubtful. Heavy Arabic numerals
refer to the Rylands papyri in the present or previous volumes, ordinary numerals to lines,
small Roman numerals to columns. In the critical notes P indicates the papyrus in question.

The principal abbreviations employed are as follows:—

A. P. F. = Archiv für Papyrologie.
B. K. T. = Berliner Klassikertexte.
Diegeseis = Αἰσχρός δι Poemī δι Callimaco, by M. Norsa and G. Vitelli.
J. E. A. = Journal of Egyptian Archaeology.
P. Cairo Zen. = Catalogue des Antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire, Zenon Papyri,
P. Bouriant = Les Papyrus Bouriant, by P. Collart.
P. Fay = Fayûm Towns and their Papyri, by B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, and D. G.
Hogarth.
P. Giss. Bibl. = Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Giessener Universitäts-
bibliothek, Parts I-IV, by H. Kling and others.
P. Harr. = The Rendel Harris Papyri, by J. Enoch Powell.
P. Iand. = Papyri Iandanae, by E. Schäfer and others.
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

P. Varsov. = Papyri Varsovienses, by G. Manteuffel.
ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA

458 (p. 3). To the reviews mentioned here should be added the important article by J. Hempel in the Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 1937, pp. 115–27; on p. 125 he remarks that ‘die in 458 zuerst bezeugte übersetzung erweist sich nun aber als die Grundlage aller anderer griechischen Zeugen in Dtn.’. Attention should also be drawn to the article of W. F. Albright in the Journal of Biblical Literature, LVI (1937), pp. 146–76, in which he argues that the Nash Hebrew papyrus should be dated in the second century B.C. and in the light of this discusses the text of 458. He, however, attributes 458 to the second half of the second century B.C.; yet the evidence for a date earlier in the century which was given in the original publication receives confirmation from the fact that 539, found with 458 and almost certainly later than it, shows an early type of text.

464 (p. 24). Mr. T. C. Skeat has pointed out to me that this fragmentary text is more likely to belong to an astrological work than to an apocryphal gospel, and a re-examination of the papyrus entirely supports his view. The 17 may be no more than the numeral 18 (it is not uncommon for lines to be placed over numerals); in l. 4 ζωδιακή can be read and both κανών (l. 7) and ἀναστολή (l. 11) are more easily explained on this assumption. Unfortunately, it was too late to change the position of 464 in the volume; but it has been indexed with the astronomical and astrological texts.

466 (pp. 28 sqq.). For the following notes on this text I am indebted to Professor Höeg:—

(I) The first of the two hymns Δάση ἐν ὑπόστασις Θεῷ is already known and is to be found in the Athos MS., Laura B 32, published in I. Eustratiadis, Εἱρμολόγιον (Chennevières-sur-Marne, 1932), as no. 218. Eustratiadis gives the title: Ἀναστολή. [Ποιήμα Γεωργίου Ἀναστολάκη]. This MS. gives only the εἰρμά or initial stanza, and as this is not given in the modern printed Heirmologion, it is difficult to find the other verses of the hymn.

(2) The reading τὴν ὑψηλοτέραν in l. 22—the initial words of the heirmos of B—may be accepted as genuine. The phrase occurs in canon 143 (Eustratiadis, op. cit., ode 8, verse 52) and probably in other hymns too.

(3) p. 32. The reference to St. Theodore Stratelates is an insufficient ground for connecting the papyrus with the church dedicated to him in Arsinoë, since his feast is celebrated by the whole orthodox church on June 8.

(4) p. 35, note to l. 4. δροθάειν often bears the meaning εἰς δρόσον μεταβάλλειν in connexion with this ode.

(5) p. 35, note to l. 39. This fragment of another hymn may be compared with a κάθσμα ἀναστάσιμων (Pentekostarion, p. 145): Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγένεται | ἡ ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κοσμικῶν.

474 (p. 65), gloss on l. 15. Professor de Zulueta suggests that the word preceding εὐρήκωμεν might be a contracted form of obligatio: cf. Ulpian, ad Edictum XXVI in Digest XII, 1, 9, pr. 1.

535 (p. 176). Mr. E. Lobel has pointed out to me that the words θύεται ἄνδρες at the beginning of l. 4 of this text are a quotation from the Dithyrambs of Pindar (frag. 77/78 in the Teubner ed., 66 in the O.C.T.). In consequence the reading Πυθαρμοῦ (correcting the βάγκων of the papyrus) may be regarded as certain.

540 (pp. 183 sqq.). It should perhaps have been stated that the notes and corrections relating to the London part of this text have not been reprinted here.
I. THEOLOGICAL TEXTS (GREEK)

457. ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL, xviii.

Acquired in 1920. First half of the second century.


The fragment is part of a leaf of a papyrus codex and thus conforms to the almost universal rule that works of Christian literature were written in the codex form (see Kenyon, Books and Readers, p. 94 sq., P. L. Hedley in The Church Quarterly Review, cxviii (1934), p. 227, and the additional evidence in P. Lond. Christ.). A codex written on this scale would have had to consist of 288 leaves or 576 pages to include all four Gospels and, as all the evidence points to the conclusion that at this early period in its history the codex had not reached such dimensions, we may infer that the codex of which 457 is a part contained only St. John's Gospel. The handwriting is good and careful and, while not calligraphic, is not that of an amateur; the scribe employed the diaeresis, but, as far as we can tell, neither breathings nor punctuation. There is no trace of numeration. A calculation of the average number of letters in each line would lead us to suspect that the name Ἰωάννης was not, as is regularly the case in other Christian MSS., abbreviated, but such calculations may be misleading, and in the absence of further evidence the question whether or not the scribe employed the usual contractions of the nomina sacra must remain open.

The importance of so small a fragment depends on the date to which it can be assigned; without recapitulating the evidence quoted in the original publication, it may be said that a date in the first half of the second century is indicated. Among undated papyri it should be compared with P. Lond. Christ. 1, the unknown Gospel in the British Museum, and with Schubart, Papyri Graecae Berolinenses 19 (c), a roll of Iliad IX, attributed to the close of the first century; and among dated texts, with P. Fay. 110 (A.D. 94) and New Palaeographical Society, ii. 98 (P. Lond. 2078), temp. Domitian. Deissmann, in an article in the DAZ for Dec. 3, 1935, would assign it to the reign of Hadrian, while Wilcken, in an article on

1 There is no internal evidence to support the view advanced by W. Bauer (Theologische Literaturzeitung, 61 (1936), 358) that the papyrus may have contained only a part of the Gospel or an earlier and different version of the Gospel.
the Bremen Papyri in Forschungen und Fortschritte, 12 (1936), p. 89, remarks that, as far as the palaeography is concerned, it might be contemporary with the Apollonius archive (A.D. 117–120). The resemblance to the hand of P. Lond. Christ. 1 is suggestive, since it is possible that the provenance of both texts is Oxyrhynchus—the parcel in which 457 was included was marked ‘from the Fayûm or Oxyrhynchus’—and thus both texts may have circulated in the same Christian community; if substantiated, this might be of importance for the literary origins of P. Lond. Christ. 1. About the text presented to us by 457 there is little to be said. In one place (l. 9) there appears to be an omission unrecorded by any other MS., and in another place (l. 4) it supports the Vaticanus against the Sinaiticus and the Alexandrinus; as Bell (loc. cit.) remarks: ‘In fact this fragment from a codex written within half a century of the composition of the Gospel presents us with the familiar text of our later authorities’.

Recto.

oi ιωνιαοι ημε[ων ουκ εξεστιν αποκτειναι] xviii. 31
ουδενα ίνα ο λο[γος του ισησον πληρωθη ου ει]
πεν σημαινοντων τω βαθατω ημελεν απο] 32
θυησεωι ιση[θλθεν ουν παλιν εις το πρατοι] 33
5 ριον ο πίλατος και εφανησεν τον ισσοι] 34
και ειπεν αυτω συ ει ο βασιλευς των ιων] [διαιον απεριθη ισσον κτι.

Verso.

[εγω εις το[υτο γεγεννημαι] 37
[και (εις τουτο) εληθθα εις τον κοσμον ίνα μαρτυ 10 [ρησο τη αληθεια πας ο οιι εκ της αληθει] [ας ακουσε μου της φωσις] λειει αυτω] 38
[o πιλατος τι εστιν αληθεια κλμι τουτο] [ειπων παλιν εξηθθεν προς τους οιι] [δαινω και λεει αυτως εγω ουδεμιαν] 39

1 L. ημιω. 4 L. ειαθθειν. 5 Or πιλατος: so too in 12.

1–2. It is clear that the scribe did not adopt the common practice, found in P. Lond. Christ. 1, 458 and other texts, of indicating either the beginning or the end of a speech by leaving a small blank space; so we cannot reckon with this in calculating the length of the lines or the size of the page. In l. 1 a diaeresis should perhaps be placed over the final iota of ιωνιαι; the traces are too faint to decide whether this is the case or whether the scribe, as in l. 13, made an iota reaching above the level of the line.

4–5. In placing παλιν before εις το πρατοίαοι, our papyrus agrees with the Vaticanus, the Codex Ephraemi, the supplementary text of the Codex Bezae, some other Gk. MSS. and the Armenian and one of the Syriac versions (also with the text of Westcott and Hort); the reverse order is supported among Gk. MSS. by the Sinaiticus and the Alexandrinus, by the Gothic version and another Syriac version, and is adopted by Tischendorf. But it should be noted that the Sa'dica, 33, 259, and a few other MSS. omit παλιν.
457. ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL, XVIII

9. If the full text is supplied in this line, we are left with 38 letters to the line in place of the average 29-30; consequently it is fairly certain that our text represents a shorter version. Most probably we should reckon with the omission of the repeated ἐς τῷ ὀφρο, perhaps a slip, but more probably a genuine variant, although unsupported by any other MS.

10. The letter after ἀλφὴ seems to have been corrected or erased: possibly we should read ἀλφ[θ], but probably the scribe's pen slipped while he was making the epsilon.

458. DEUTERONOMY, xxiii-xxviii.

Acquired in 1917.

Frag. (a) 10.7 × 4.5 cm. Second century B.C.

Separately published, with facsimiles, in Two Biblical Papyri in the John Rylands Library (Manchester University Press, 1936), pp. 9-46, and reprinted in The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, xx (1936), pp. 219-45. For a detailed description of the MS., and a discussion of its historical and textual importance, the reader is referred to these publications and also to reviews by H. G. Opitz and H. H. Schaeder (Zeitschrift für die NT. Wissenschaft, 35 (1936), pp. 115-7), A. Vaccari (Biblica, 17 (1936), pp. 501-4), and P. Katz (Theologische Literaturzeitung, 61 (1936), 340). These fragments of a papyrus roll of Deuteronomy—the only pre-Christian evidence for the text of any part of the O.T.—were recovered from two pieces of mummy cartonnage which, besides small scraps of Greek and Demotic documents, yielded the Homer, 539, and some small unidentified literary texts (496, 499, 501-3); a strip of 539 had actually been wrapped round frag. (b) of 458. The Deuteronomy fragments, scattered among chapters xxiii-xxviii, were found in both pieces of cartonnage; since the original publication the small fragment (e) has been identified by Prof. T. W. Manson as belonging to xxvii. 15.

The Deuteronomy papyrus is written in a stylized and formal hand, carefully executed and of considerable elegance; the closest parallels to it are P. Tebt. III. 692 and 697, both probably of the middle of the second century B.C. Further evidence for the date is provided by the documentary hand on the verso of 458, which is characteristic of the late second century, and by the other literary fragments. Punctuation is only found at the end of a verse (e.g. I. 14), where the point is followed by a considerable blank space; elsewhere the scribe leaves a small space at the end of a group of words and a slightly larger one at the end of a sentence or clause. There are no abbreviations in the extant text; but there is reason for thinking (see note to l. 27) that κυρίος was left unabbreviated.

The only indication of provenance is to be found in the Demotic scraps in which the name Setwoθi = Σετωθοῖ occurs; the name is very common in the Fayum and very rare elsewhere. A Fayumic origin is not in itself at all improbable; we know of several Jewish

\[1\] In a letter of July 23, 1936; it was independently identified by Katz in the review cited above. This has made it necessary to change the numeration of the fragment and the lines; the fragment in question, now (e), was (f) in the original publication.

\[2\] The fact that the Homer papyrus, 539, exhibits an 'eccentric' text makes it improbable that it was written much later than the middle of the century; further, it is likely that the other texts, literary and documentary, yielded by the cartonnage, are contemporary with the verso of 458 rather than with the recto.
settlements in the Fayûm in the Ptolemaic period, and the fact that the scraps of Greek and Demotic documents found with 458 contain no Jewish names might argue for a common provenance from a mixed community of the kind common in the Fayûm.¹

The most notable feature of the text of the papyrus is its divergence from the text of the Vaticanus (B)²; in passages where the reading is disputed there are three agreements with B and fifteen disagreements. With the Washington MS. (9), on the other hand, there are eleven agreements, and with the Alexandrinus (A) ten, though, as Vaccari (loc. cit.) points out, 458 as a rule only supports A, when the latter gives what is the text of the majority of MSS. ; at the same time he points out that, in its rarer readings, it more often agrees with g and n, two minuscule MSS. representing the Lucianic recension. 458 presents us with four new readings, one of which—ἐπελθησε—warrants consideration on its merits, while another—καθελε—is closer to the Hebrew than to the rest of the Greek tradition. The general conclusion that the evidence best warrants is, as pointed out by Opitz and Schaeder (loc. cit.), that 458 represents an independent text, closer to the Hebrew original, which has greatly influenced the formation of the A text.

(a) 10.7 x 4.5 cm.

(b) 8 x 8.4 cm.

¹ For a more detailed discussion, see Two Biblical Papry. p. 28 sq.

² But, as J. A. Montgomery (Journal of Biblical Literature, iv (1936), p. 310) points out, the disagreements of the papyrus are often with B's unique, or almost unique, errors, i.e. the divergence from the text of B's family is slighter than statistics might suggest.
20 [αὐτῷ καὶ μαστίγωσιν [αυτὸν εναντίον]
[οὐ κατὰ τὴν ασεβείαν αὐτοῦ]
[ἀριθμῷ]: τεσσαρακοτὰ [μαστίγωσιν]
[σὺν αὐτῷ οὐ προσθῆσοι[σὺν εαυτῷ δὲ]
[προσθῶσιν μαστίγωσιν αὐτὸν κτλ.]

(c) 4.9 x 2.3 cm.

25 [τῇ χηρᾷ καὶ φήγου[τα εἰς ταῖς ποῖον]
[λεενίν σου] καὶ έμπλησθήσονταί κτλ.]

(d) 4 x 3.4 cm.

[τῆς φωνῆς αὐτο[ν] καὶ κύριος εὐλογεῖ]
[σὺν σημερήν γενεσθαι αὐτῶν λαον περί]
[οὕτων καθαρές ειπεν φυλαίσθεν τα]

30 [σας τας εὐφοράς αὐτον καὶ ειναι σε]
[υπεραπτώ παισων [τῶν εθνών οὐ]
[εποιηθέν] σε ονομαστον καὶ καυχήμα]

(e) 1.1 x 2.1 cm.

[επικαταρατος αρθρωσιος αρτί σε[νή]
[σει γλυπτον καὶ χανεψιον βδελυγμα]

(xxvii. 15)

(f) 5.7 x 1.8 cm.

35 [τα προβάτα σου δεδομένα τους εχθροις]
[σου καὶ ουκ εστίν αι διόνθων οι νυσί]
[καὶ οἱ θυγατὲρες δεδομεναι ευθεῖ]
[ετεροι καὶ οἱ υφήθαινοι [σου οφονται]
[σφακοιξίων εις] αυτα καὶ ουκ ὑσχιν]

40 [σει η χερ σου τα εκφορὰς τῆς γῆς σου καὶ]
[παντας τους πόνους σου φαγεῖαι εθνοι]
[ο ουκ επισταται καὶ εφι σι αδίκουμενος κτλ.]

(xxviii. 31)

Unplaced fragments.

(g) 1.2 x 1.4 cm.
1. This line as it stands is rather longer than the rest: that the και was omitted (with m and some of the versions) is unlikely, as it is retained in the parallel passage l. 19. One of the cursives, π, reads γχρι and this may have been the reading of our text. It is to be noted that in placing στάχις after εν τούς χεριν the papyrus agrees with all the uncials against the Ethiopic and Bohairic versions, and Eusebius. But the length of the line makes it very probable that it agrees with ι and l in omitting σων after χεριν.

2. This line appears to project into the margin more than the others, whereas γ is inset.

3. In reading εις τον ὡμορν the papyrus agrees with all MSS. except B, which has εις 'ὑμορν.

4. The reading επέλθης, peculiar to the papyrus, is of some interest, since επέρχομαι is the terminus technicus in the papyrus for trespassing, making an illegal entrance, and as such occurs frequently in documents of the Ptolemaic period, whereas επέρχομαι (επέλθης) is the reading of all MSS. here. In legal language denotes to proceed against or make claims against in a court of law. Thus the reading of our text is interesting evidence of the influence of the ordinary terminology of the period. Vaccari (loc. cit.) would prefer the vulgar reading on the ground that επέρχομαι is not found elsewhere in the LXX in this sense.

5. In reading φυεσσή our text is supported only by Aς and some cursives, f l n y. Subsequently all MSS. (with the exception of l, which reads λυπησάμην) give λυπησάμην: πληθύσμαι may have been the reading of the papyrus, but, with the preceding nominative, πληθύσμη is more likely. On this passage, Driver writes that the Hebrew is nearer to the text of B than to that of the papyrus, but that the Hebrew infinitive ('thou shalt eat grapes according to thy soul thy being filled') is so awkward that it is generally thought to be a gloss. He suggests that our text may be an attempt to simplify it by substituting a finite verb, much as the Syriac ('until thy soul (is) being satisfied') tries to do.

6. In reading ἐμβάλας, the papyrus agrees with Bgn (ἐμβάλας) and other MSS. against AςFπ and a few cursives.

10. εφέσσα: so B and other MSS. (including Θ) against the εφέσσας of AςFMN and a number of cursives.

11. Θ and M, together with some cursives, read γραψή here.

14. It seems probable that the scribe only punctuated at the end of a verse, as here after ανου; the space between it and the following και is larger than is usual.

19. Here the papyrus has a somewhat remarkable agreement with Θ in its reading δωτῆς, supported also by a number of minuscules, including g and n: all other uncials read δωτῆς.

20. Between the α and σ of ματστγώσαν a dot is visible; apparently the scribe wrote ματστγώσαν, then corrected the r to a σ, erasing the left horizontal stroke of the r, and the apparent dot is the remnant of the hook of the original r.

20 sqq. The text of this and of the following lines, now in agreement with AFMNΘ, and now providing new readings of its own, differs so markedly from that of B that before discussing the readings in detail it may be as well to give the text, considerably shorter than ours, supplied by B. Continuing from δ δωτῆς, B reads: καθαίρεις αὕτων ἐναντίων αὐτῶν. *καλ λαθήμε τεσσεράκοντα ματστγώσων αὐτῶν, οί προσθέσασιν εάν δέ προσθήση ματστγώσας κλπ.

(a) In reading και before καθαίρεις the papyrus agrees with AFMN and many cursives against ΒΘγν.

(b) καθαίρεις is peculiar to the papyrus. The only variants noted to καθαίρεις are the καθαίρεις of I and Cyril and the constituent (or -ου) of the Armenian and Ethiopic versions.

(c) Between the καθαίρεις αὕτων and the ἐναντίων αὐτῶν of ΒΑΦΜΝΘ and the versions insert ἐναντίων κρίτων καὶ ματστγώσων αὐτῶν. Neither of these texts can have been quite that of the papyrus, but
458. DEUTERONOMY, XXIII–XXVIII

in sense it is closer to the reading of AFMNO. After εις[αυτων] it seems best to supply αυτου (or εαυτου), as suggested by Driver; it is, however, short and εις[αυτων] ευνω λαβον would fill the space a little better, but though this phrase is found in Deut. x. 11 the sense is different and there is no support for its presence here: whereas σωτερ = ατερ would correspond to the τως κρινων of AFMNO. For the sense of the papyrus version must be ‘for he (sc. the judge) shall cast him (the offender) down in his (the judge’s) presence’. Both the Hebrew and the Syriac Peshitta provide an interesting parallel to this version (for what follows I am indebted to Driver): in this and the following lines the Peshitta has ‘if the guilty be guilty of chastisement, the judge shall cast him down and they shall scourge him according to the due of his folly’. Similarly the text implied singular and plural forms of the verb were hardly distinguished (Driver).

3rd, not in the longer version makes it very likely that it would be possible to read κατωτις (omitted after the loss of the singular verb in the Hebrew is probably due to Masoretic vocalization, as in early unvocalized texts this phrase is found in Deut. x.

4th, the space better. Unfortunately in both cases conclusive proof is lacking; but it looks as though the practice, commonplace in the texts of Sa'idic, Ethiopic, possibly inserted after the loss of the whole clause is unrepresented in B. It may be noted that the papyrus may well have read εις[αυτους]—it would suit the space rather better—and that the large space left after αυτου suggests that κατωτις αυτου belongs to the following rather than to the preceding sentence.

(f) In l. 22 the papyrus certainly omitted the και before αριθμειω, found only in B, where it was probably inserted after the loss of κατωτις αυτου.

24. Here again the papyrus agrees with AFMNO and other authorities in reading πρωσθευνων against B’s πρωσθει: consequently I have followed these MSS. in supplying σωτερ in this line (omitted only by B).

It may be noted that the Syriac Peshitta also has ‘when they add’ and the Hebrew ‘he shall not add’: the singular verb in the Hebrew is probably due to Masoretic vocalization, as in early unvocalized texts singular and plural forms of the verb were hardly distinguished (Driver).

26. In the supplement I have followed AFMNO and their allies rather than B’s εφθαρμιθετων.

27. It is probable that αγνωσω was written in full, i.e. that the scribe did not employ the theological contractions almost universal in later MSS. If he had written αγνωσω there would be only 24 letters in the line, whereas the average number of letters in a line is 27. Similar calculations in the case of 457 (see An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel, p. 18) led to the conclusion that there also nomina sacra were written in full. Unfortunately in both cases conclusive proof is lacking; but it looks as though the practice, whatever its origin, only became general in the course of the second century A.D.

28. The omission of εις after γενεσθαι is of some interest, for while all uncials agree in reading it, it is not in the Hebrew text, which has simply ‘to be’ (Driver), and is also absent from the Armenian version and the cursives αγνωσω and the texts of Philo and Clement. It is at least evidence that such a reading, which might have been thought to be of comparatively late origin in Greek MSS., is, even if wrong, of considerable antiquity.

30. σωτερ omitted after εις[αυτους]: so BG, Sa’dic, Ethiopic.

31. The fact that elsewhere the papyrus consistently follows AFMNO and other MSS. in preferring the longer version makes it very likely that πασας (omitted by B) was inserted before των ενναλατ; it also fills the space better.

35. A new column begins with this fragment. In this column the lines are slightly longer than in preceding columns; the average number of letters to a line is 49.

36. o βασιλευ: omitted only by B. The length of the line makes it highly probable that the papyrus omitted σωτερ after νου as it certainly did after θυγατρες in l. 37. For this latter omission it has the support of the second corrector of F; for the former there is no other authority. We should expect both to be written or both to be omitted; probably this may be claimed as a new, if unimportant, variant for the papyrus. The length of the line suggests that a σωτερ may have been omitted in l. 40 also.

38. Reasons of space as well as the general affinity of the MS. make it fairly probable that the papyrus
read ϕουναι with FGMNΩγυ and most of the cursives rather than βλήψωναι with B al.; it is in any case preferable to the ψόναι—equally suitable as far as the space goes—of A.

39. As usual, the papyrus agrees with all other MSS. against B and reads καί before ουκ ὅρκοςαι.

44. If some part of εἰσίρχει is to be recognized here, this fragment cannot stand in close relation to any of the others, as, except in xxiv. 1, the text of which is preserved in (a), the word is not found in or near the passages represented here. It does, however, occur in xxii frequently and in xxviii. 2.

459. ISAIAH, xxi, xxii.

Acquired in 1917. 22.7 x 3.3 cm.  
Fifth to sixth century.  
PLATE 4.

This strip, from a leaf of a magnificently written vellum codex, is fortunately complete in height, so that some estimate can be formed of the character of the original book. The lower margin is 4 cm., the upper (which may have been damaged) 2.8 cm.; the average number of letters in a line is 27, so that the measurements of the text (and those of the page would have been in proportion) were 16 x 13 cm. Each page contained only one column of text. The position of the fragment in the leaf is decided by the titles in I. 28 and I. 50, as it is fairly obvious that the scribe began a new line with the title, and he has, in fact, filled up what remains with scroll-work.

Palaeographically the MS. is of some interest, and will stand comparison with some of the best hands of the period. It bears a general resemblance to the Washington MS. of the Psalms (i.e. the hand responsible for the bulk of that MS.), although the scribe of 459 had a distinctly lighter touch, and it can hardly be later than the Vienna Dioscorides (E. M. Thompson, Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography, p. 216) of the first half of the sixth century. Another similar hand of the period, which also avoids the heavy style of some MSS., is the Vatican Cassius Dio (plate in Cavalieri-Lietzmann, Spec. Cod. Graec. 2). The distinctive features of the hand (not to be found in either the Washington MS. or the Cassius Dio) are the unusually angular ε and the curved ω. I should assign the MS. to the fifth, or perhaps to the sixth century. Punctuation and other marks appear to be in the first hand; the title in I. 50 (though not that in I. 28) is distinctly smaller than the rest of the text, but is in the same hand. A rough breathing is placed over η, but not over other vowels.

Textually the MS. is too small to be of much use, but it may be observed that in the case of two disputed readings of some importance (ll. 16 and 21) it sides with the Codex Sinaiticus (a) and the Codex Alexandrinus (A) against the Codex Vaticanus (B), as it does on two, and possibly on four, other occasions. In ll. 37 and 49, however, it supports B against the other MSS., as it does B and a in ll. 43 and 51. It does not follow A where it is unsupported by a, and its closest affinity is with the latter MS. It should be noted that in l. 33 it apparently supports the Codex Rescriptus Cryptoferratensis (f) against the rest of the tradition. Collation is with the text of Swete (Cambridge, 1894).
Recto.

[kai] ὁδίνες [ελαβον με ὅσ την τικτον]  

[σαυ]· ἡδίκησα το μη' ακουσαί]  

[εσπτ'ουβασα [τον μη' βλέπειν]  

[ ] ὁ καρδία [μου πλαναται ανομια με]  

5 [βασιμίζει]· [ψυχη μου εφεστηκε]  

[εις] φοβον· [ετομαστον την τρα]  

[πεζαν] φαγετε πιετε αναστατεσ]  

[οι αρ]χαντες [ετομασατε θυρεους]  

[διοιτι ουτοις ειπεν προς με κυριου]  

10 [βαζουσα στεινω τηγην σκοπου]  

[kαι] ο εαν ἰδης αναγγειλον και ειδοι]  

[ανιαβατας [πτες δυο αναβατηρι]  

[ονοι] και αναβατηρ καμηλου]  

[ακροασαι ακροασιν πολλην και]  

15 [κα]λεσαν σωρειαν εις την σκɔπαν]  

[κυριου] και ειπεν εστην δια παντος]  

[ημικρας· και εις της παρεμβολης]  

[ευω εστην οθην την νυκτα και]  

[ιδου] αυτοις [ερχεται αναβατης]  

20 [συνωριδος· και αποκριθεις ειπεν]  

[τειττωκεν [βαβυλων και πανται]  

[τα] αγαλματα [αυτης και τα χειροτοι]  

[ητη] αυτης [σωτερινη εις την]  

[γη'ν']· [ακουσατε οι κατα]  

25 [αλλαμενοι και οι ουνωμενοι]  

[ακρουσατε α [γηκουσα παρα κυριου σαβαωθ]  


Verso.

[o theos του Ισραηλ ανηγγειλην ημων]  

[το οραμα της Ιδουμααις : : ~ — —]  

[προς εμε καλει παρα] του Θεο[ν]  

30 [λασσετε επαλξεις]· φυλασσωσ το]  

[πρω και την νυκτα· εαν ζητησ]  

[ζητει και παρ εμοι ουκει· εν τω [δρυμω]  

[εστερεσ κομηθησεσθαι εν τη [νυ]  

[Δαιδαλ εις συναινησον δικαιοτε]  

35 [υδαρ εφετε οι ενοικουντες [εν χω]  

[ρα Θαμα αρτος συναινησατε τοις]  

[φειγουσιν δια τη πληθος [των τη]  

[φοινικωμεν και δια τη πληθος [των]  

[πλανωμενων και δια τη πληθος της]  

40 [μαχαιρας και δια τη πληθος των το] C
3. The relative shortness of this line and the gap at the beginning of L 4 may be due to the fact that with η καρδία a new verse begins; when the end of the verse coincides with a definite break in the sense the scribe leaves a gap of considerable length (in L 24 of nearly 3 cm.). Possibly 459 added απ' ου; but there is no other support for this.

4. The reading given in the text is that of the seventh-century correctors ε.κ.κ. of Ν, which alone suits the available space; both that of Ν* διαμοίρα με καί η διαμοίρα με and that of Β καί η διαμοίρα με are too long.

7. φανερῶς πιστευεί as ΒΓ: tr. ΝΑΩ.

9. Ν: δι' Β. The former would exactly fill the gap at the beginning of the line, unless we assume that this was left blank for the new verse; there is, however, no break in the sense and probably the scribe only punctuates at the end of a sentence.

11. o: or Ν*Β* (vid.) Γ 53. ἐὰν ΑΩΓ ε.κ.κ.: δ' Β.

12. Most probably the papyrus omitted the καί after δόω with ΝΑΩΓ.

16. κυρίων καί ἐπεν ΝΑΩΓ: κυρίος ἐπεν Β.

18. εἰς ομ. ΑΩ.

21. πετάσκευ ΝΑΩΓ: πετάσκευ πετάσκευ Β. It is practically certain that the papyrus agrees with ΝΑΩΓ here.

23. Possibly εὐπλήθησαν with ΝΑΩΓ, which would suit the space better.

30. Though the end of the verse is marked by a stop, there is no gap; the break in the sense, however, between the verses is slight (contrast l. 43).

33. κομμηθηκοῦσα Γ: κομμηθηκε rell.

34. ἐδώρ ιδιωτί Α.

37. In this, a disputed reading of some importance, there can be little doubt that 459 agrees with Β and (on the evidence of Ω) Origen and the hexaplaric text in reading πεθανομένων instead of the πεθανόντων of ΝΑΩΓ (the former is printed by Swete, the latter by Rahlfis): the latter would leave the next line impossibly short.

43. διότι ΒΝ: δ' ΑΩΓΓ.

45. 1. ἐκλειψει.

46. λοιπὸν Ν.

49. The words are given in this order by Β: ἐλάλησεν ο δ' ἰδιω ΝΑΩΓ.

51. δ' οὖν ΒΝ: oun δ' ΑΩΓ.

460. FRAGMENT OF A TESTIMONY BOOK.

Acquired in 1917. Fourth century.

Published with 458 in Two Biblical Papyri; for reviews, &c., see the references given on p. 3. Two other fragments of the same bifolium (reprinted here as ll. 1-9, 28-37, 52-61, and
76-84) were published as P. Oslo II; P. Oslo II, frag. i, forms the upper part of folio 1, P. Oslo II, frag. ii, the upper part of folio 2 of 460. The text consists of passages from different parts of the Septuagint, the majority from Isaiah; the connexion between them appears to be that they are all capable of bearing a Messianic interpretation and so might serve for purposes of propaganda. There is little doubt that the codex to which these leaves belong was a book of Testimonies, i.e. passages from the O.T. which can witness to the truth of the N.T. Two such works are extant, the Testimonia of St. Cyprian and the Testimonia adversus Judaeos attributed to St. Gregory of Nyssa; but the selection of passages quoted in 460 proves that it is independent of both these works.

A complete page of the codex probably measured some 28×11 cm. and contained 30 lines to the column. The hand is crude and irregular, though clear, and resembles P. Oxy. 209, a schoolboy’s copy of Romans i. 1-7, which can be dated in the early fourth century.

Our text may be assigned to the same period, and as the Oslo fragments were purchased in the Fayum, the Fayum is the most likely place of origin. The usual theological contractions occur, and in place of final ν a short stroke is commonly added above the preceding vowel. Stops have been added by the first hand, with the exception of that in l. 12, which, with the mark against l. 15, is in black ink. The rest of the MS. is written in a reddish-brown ink which is better preserved in the Oslo fragments than in the Rylands text. The end of a quotation is marked by a stop, followed in l. 12 by a short horizontal line; there is no trace of subject headings.

It is not to be expected that the text of such a M.S. would be of any importance for textual criticism; neither its omissions (as in l. 17 and l. 24) nor additions (as in l. 49) are of any significance, although a tendency to disagree with Vaticanus (B) may be noticed, e.g. l. 15, 45, 46, 95. The textual notes attached to P. Oslo II have not been repeated: those relating to the Rylands fragment will be found after the text. The passages preserved in the Oslo fragments are underlined in the transcription.
12 THEOLOGICAL TEXTS (GREEK)

Folio i, verso.

[οὐχ] ὤνταί καὶ οἱ
[οὐκ] ακηκοασίν τινὶν

30 ἰησοῦν τῷ κύριῳ τῷ
ἐπιστευείν τὴν αὐτῷ
[ἡ] ἠμῶν καὶ ὁ βραχὸς
[ψ] ρῶν κυρίῳ των
ἀπεκαλύφθη

35 [ἀρνηγειλαμέν']
[εὐαντιὼν αὐτοῦ]
[ὡς παιδίου ὡς πί]
[ἢ ἐν γὰς διήφωση]
[οὐκ εἰσὶν εἰδὸς]

40 [αὐτὸ ὁδὸς δοξᾶ]
[καὶ εἰδοὺμεν αὐτῷ]
[καὶ οὐκ] εἰκὲν εἰδὸς
[οιδὲ καλλὸς· ἀλλὰ]
[το] εἰδὸς αὐτοῦ αὐτῷ

45 [μὴν καὶ εκλειπὼν]
[πάντας τῶν πάντων]
[μιῶν] τῶν ἀνθρωπῶν
[ἀνθρωπίας] ἐν πλήθῳ
[καὶ] εἰς τὸν

50 [καὶ] εἰδὶς φέρειν
[μαλακίαν ὁτι]

Folio ii, recto.

[μὲν] Καὶ οἱ εὐφερεῖν
[ὡς οἴῳ μέγας εύχε]
[ὡς δὲ] αὐτῷ

3 [κτῆμα πάντων]
[καὶ κτῆμα βοῶν]
[καὶ γεωργία πολλὰ]

85 [ ] . ἡγ.

[Παραλειπομένων]

Folio ii, verso.

αὐτὸν διὰ τοῦ
ἀμαρτίας ημῶν

55 θὰ συνεχῆ ἔγειρεν
to στόμα αὐτῶν
[ὡς βροτάτων]
ἐπὶ σφαγῆν ηεθῆ]
καὶ ὡς αμφότερος

60 εὐαντίον τοῦ

κε[ποθῖτος αὐτῷ] 11

ρος· καὶ τὰς αμαρτίας αὐτῶν 12

αὐσιγε διὰ τοῦτο 65

σει πολλοῖς καὶ [τοὺς]

ιςχυρῶν μέχρει 70

σκύλῳ αὐθ[τοῦ]

παρέδοθε εἰς θα 75

[καὶ] διῆχε [ας αμαρτίιας]

[σει] πολλοῖς καὶ [τοὺς]

ανομοί[ς] ἐλογισθῆ 80

καὶ αὐτοῖς αμαρτίας

πολλοὶ αὑρεγεκιν

75 [καὶ] διῆχε [ας αμαρτίας]

Folio ii, verso.

αὐτὸν διὰ τοῦ
ἀμαρτίας ημῶν

7 [καὶ] δεινὸν ἐξ ἐνη
to συνεχῆ ἔγειρεν
[ὡς δὲ] αὐτῷ

95 [καὶ] δεινὸν ἐξ ἐνη
15. The papyrus agrees with Ν against Β, etc., in adding επισταμαί after αυτών. The sign placed in the margin against this line is probably a form of the common = δομινον; that it calls attention to the uncertain reading is not likely.

17. All MSS. read πάντα τά ἐθνη καλ before τάς γλωσσας: Ν adds αυτών.

20. Read καθήθησεν.

22. No other authority is cited for αποστέλλω in place of εξαποστελέω.

24. After Θερεθία the MSS. read καὶ Φώκ. καὶ Λοιδ.; one of the two has clearly been omitted in the papyrus.

25. Read Θοβελ.

45. om. καὶ ΑΩ. έκλεισθη: so A and a later hand of Ω; Β reads ἐκλείσθην.

46. Probably read τόρ(τς); it is just possible that the scribe wrote the ς in the next line, cf. εργα in l. 12. παντας τοις της έκλεισθην ας ΝΟΙ: om. παντας ΒΓ: παντας αποστελέως ΑΩ.

49. καὶ εν πτω. This addition, not found in any other MS., was probably transferred by the writer from v. 4: ἐλεγχόμενα αὐτόν εἶναι εν πάνω καὶ εν πληγῇ.

83 sq. It is fairly clear that the writer did not continue the passage from Genesis which runs ἄξιον έργα τοίς προστάταις; these three lines probably contained a quotation from another book, the title of which—a short one, as it has left no traces—was written in the space between 82 and 83.

93. αποστέλλω: so the versions and some of the cursives: the uncialms read αποστελέω. For the significance of this reading, see P. Katz, Theologische Literaturzeitung, 61 (1936), 341.

95. εν πατρί(ς): so ΑΛΩ and the versions: εν πάνω Β. καὶ before έν πάνω is also omitted by the Bohairic and a few cursives.

460. FRAGMENT OF A TESTIMONY BOOK

461. PSALMS iii and lxii.

Acquired in 1917. Fragment (c) 8.5 x 7.4 cm. Sixth century.

Four fragments of a tall sheet of rather rough parchment containing verses from the third Psalm, one of which is misplaced, and the opening of the sixty-second Psalm. When complete the sheet must have been more than 30 cm. in height, and as the length of the line is only 7 cm., it is probable that there was originally a second column of which no traces have survived, and in which the scribe continued the sixty-second Psalm; whatever the purpose of the text, it is hardly likely that he would break off in the middle of a sentence in l. 28. Probably this sheet of parchment was used as a protective amulet; the verses of the Psalms chosen are obviously suitable for that purpose, although they have not hitherto occurred among the Christian amulets on papyri (see the list in Mlle Préaux’s article ‘Une Amulette Chrétienne’, Chronique d’Égypte, 20 (1935), 365). Further, the bottom of fragment (d), just below the end of the column, has been stitched up with thread, some of which still remains; this suggests that when complete the sheet was rolled up and the ends stitched together, thus being rendered more portable. It might indicate that at some

1 To this list should probably be added P. Giss. Bibl. 34, a sheet of parchment containing verses from Psalms lxiii (lxiv) and cxii (cxii), which the editor attributes to the fourth century. It may, however, be a collection of miscellaneous verses arranged alphabetically (the verse from Ps. cxii precedes that from lxiii).
later period the strip was used as a binding sheet. The hand is a good sloping uncial, regular and neat, and may belong to the sixth century; the punctuation at the end of the verse is in the same hand. On the verso (the hair-side) are remains of writing in a large sprawling hand of later date; unfortunately in the largest fragment, (c), very little is decipherable. On (a) can be read: (l. 2) ποιεσ (ποιης) αυτα, (l. 3) οαμα ρεπει, (l. 4) πελλοντες αδη; on (b), (l. 7) έν: οτι εσεθη, (l. 8) το αντος τι, (l. 9) πατηρ φι, (l. 10) μου σειρ ή; on (c), (l. 13) εψεσην ηρηλι, (l. 14) εν χιλεσω εν χιλεσω ητων σου. Apart from ll. 13-14, which may be read as εψεσην (l. εψεσην) (η) ηρηλις εν χιλεσω (l. χιλεσω) σου = Psalm xliv. 3, I have been unable to identify any of these passages. A line drawn below l. 14 indicates that the scribe did not proceed with Psalm xliv. L. 9 at any rate does not appear to come from any passage in the Psalms.

The text is collated with Swete, The Old Testament in Greek, and Rahlfs, Septuaginta (Stuttgart, 1933). The testimony of such a text cannot be of much value; for what it is worth it may be noted that it twice supports Alexandrinus against Vaticanus. The provenance of the text is unknown.

(a)

συ μου ει [δοξα μου] και ψολωμην γην κεφα
λοι όν μου ηνκοιή
μου προσ κερων εξεκρα
5 έα και ευσηκον[σεν]
με εν ορων σειου
[α]γιον

(b)

[α]πο [μ]ηρισθων λαου
των κυνεω σου
10 επετειεκεων μοι
άναστα κυριε σεσου με] ο [θεος] μου οτι [συ επα]
[τα]βασ παντας [τους]
[εξθαμ]νοντας μοι

(c)

15 [σοι]ν η ενωγνω σου
εγω δε εκ[σ]
461. PSALMS III AND LXII

μηθην καὶ υπνωσα
eξενερηθη στι κυριος αυ
τιληψετο μου

20 οθεως ο θεως μου προς σε αρ[ρ]
[θερμω] ενεπιμενεν
σε τη ψιχη μου
ποιμ[απλος] σοι η σαρξ

(d)

[sυν το ελεος σου]
25 υπερ ζωας τα χει
λη μου επενσω
σω σε σωνος εν
λογησω σαι εν τη

2. υψων, i.e. υψων P. 4. κω P; so in 11 and 18. 5. ελεοςων. 9. συνεπιμενεν. 11. ο written over first a of αναστα. 12. θεως P; so in 20. 17. υπνωσα, i.e. υπνωσα P. 18. εξενερηθη. αυτιληψετα. 21. ενεπιμενεν. 23. ποιμαπλος. 24. i.e. κρεισσον 26. επενσων. 27. ουσω. 28. σε.

1. In the MSS. this verse runs: "ον δε, κόρα, αυτιληψη το μου ει, δοξα μου κτλ.
3. The beginning of the new verse is marked by a gap as well as by punctuation.
5. The parchment supports the Alexandrinus and the Psalterium Graeco-Latinum Veronense (R) in reading επενσων for καποιανον.
7. The rest of the line was presumably left blank (cf. l. 16) to mark the δισφαλμα. Between (a) and (b) only one line is lost containing the beginning of v. 7 ου φοβηθησομαι.
9. συνεπιμενεν ΝΑΡ: επενσων B.
14. Between (b) and (c) four lines are missing if v. 8 was written out in full and assuming that the reading of l. 15 is correct. What is certain is that in (c) the scribe went back to v. 6 of the psalm, so it is probable that in the intervening space, otherwise unaccounted for, he wrote out vv. 8 and 9.
16. There is nothing to indicate that the scribe recognized that this verse was out of place. The papyrus follows the Alexandrinus in reading δε after εγω.
22. σε instead of σω is the reading of Β P. Να and also of the Turin Psalter (T).
23. Assuming that Ps. lxii was written in full, 6 lines must intervene between (c) and (d).

462. PSALMS cxlviii–cl.

Acquired in 1917. 28 x 7 cm. Sixth to seventh century.

This peculiar text, written on the flesh-side of a vertical strip of parchment, consists of phrases reproduced in order, but without regard to their sense, from Psalms cxlviii, cxlix, and cl. The text starts with Ps. cxlviii. 9 and, with the exception of the last two verses, the
scribe has copied down the initial words of each verse, at times the whole phrase. He has followed the same procedure in Ps. cxlix; but in Ps. cl, where each verse consists of two nearly equal phrases each beginning with αλλ'εις, he has written down the initial words of each phrase, so that the text of this psalm is not far from complete. The scribe's knowledge of orthography (cf. αυτοκη for ευθοκει in 1. 10) and of grammar (cf. αυτοι for αυτοί in 1. 15) is of the scantiest, and the fact that he spells ποιήσαι ποιήση in 1. 13 and πετας(ε) in 1. 15 suggests that he wrote to dictation. In contrast to this, the hand, of the bold slanting variety (cf. Abb. 99 in Schubart's Griechische Palaeographie), is distinctly good, and the usual contractions of the nomina sacra occur. It is hard to say how much is missing; the enlarged initial letters make it clear that the lines are substantially complete, but this column may have been preceded by another one or even two. The sheet of parchment cannot have been much higher than it is, nor is it likely that the writer started in the middle of Ps. cxlviii. More puzzling is the purpose of this text. This irrationally abridged form can hardly have been intended for ordinary reading, nor can it have been used in church except possibly for antiphonal singing. Possibly it may have been used as an amulet, for, though the psalms here copied have no obvious prophylactic power, Mlle Claire Préaux has recently argued ('Une Amulette Chrétienne', Chronique d'Égypte, 20, 1935, pp. 361-70: the amulet in question consists of the third verse of Ps. xxviii (xxix) that any passage glorifying the power and majesty of God might be used to repel the powers of evil. The elaborate αλφα and ωμεγα, with crosses in between, followed by the Chi-Rho below, support this view. Such a MS. can be of little or no textual value; but it is interesting to note—since the elaborate ornament implies, I think, that the scribe had reached the end of the book he was copying—that his MS. omitted the ψαλμος ἰδιόγραφος, cli (BT add it after the subscription). The usual contractions of the nomina sacra are found and the final words of the line are frequently abbreviated. On the verso are a few scrawlings, mostly of numerals, in a rough cursive hand. The provenance of the text is unknown.

---

\[\text{cxlviii. 9} \]
\[\text{cxlix. 1} \]

---

1 Parchment rolls are mentioned by ancient writers, but the only examples known to me are 29, P.S.I. 15 (doubtful), P. Lit. Lond. 211 and the fragment of Tatian's Diatessaron from Dura (ed. G. H. Kuenning, London, 1935). That either the present text or 401 or P. Giss. Bibl. 34 consisted of more than a single sheet seems unlikely: v. Schubart, Das Buch, p. 109.

2 The Psalm most commonly used for magical purposes was xc. Cf. the list in Mlle Préaux's article, p. 365.

3 Mr. T. C. Skeat suggests that this text may be one column of [? Latin]-Greek glossary to the Psalms; and, though the lines in this column are complete, there may have been another column to the right. But the omission of so many difficult words in cxlix and the repetition of αλλ'εις in cl tell against this view.
462. PSALMS CXLVIII-CL

10 οτι αυτοκη κυριος
καυχησουτε
και υψωσιν τον θεον
του ποιησε εκδικαιων
του δουσιν τους
15 του πειρασε εν αυτα
ενιτε τον θεον εν της αγιουσ
ενιτε αυτου εν [η] τω στρεψωματι]
ενιτε αυτου επι δες τυφνοις

ties αυτου

20 ενιτε αυτου κατα το πληθος
eνιτε αυτου εν εχω σαλπηγγος;
ενιτε αυτου εν ψαλτηριω
ενιτε αυτου εν δυμπανα]
eνιτε απητ(οι) εν χορτοις και

25 [ενιτε] εν κυμαλα
ευειχους
[ ] φιλαλαγμ(ο)ν
πασα πυον ενεσατω

{νο} τον κυριον

3. Ι. βασιλεις. 5. Ι. εξομολόγησε. 6. ήμως Ρ. 9. Ι. αλυσδώσαν. 10. Ι. είδοκει. 11. Ι. καυ-


5. For the opening words of this verse—αλυσινας το δομα κυριου—the writer has substituted two

words from the final phrase, just as in l. 6 he has taken two words from the middle phrase of v. 14.

6. αυτου παοι (τους οσιους αυτου). It is clear that the MS, which our scribe copied retained these words, as
do A, Ν and other MSS.; they are omitted by the Vaticanus.

8. For this unusual contraction of Ιεραπλ (ηλι is the most commonest), see L. Traube, Nomina Sacra, p. 107;
it is also found in Ν and in the Vienna Genesis of the fifth-sixth century (Traube, p. 75).

12. Και for αλ here the scribe may have been influenced by the kal ψαλη of cxlviii. 14.

17. και is absent from the MSS.

25. [ενιτε]: add. αυτων cett.

27. The second half of this verse runs αυτη [α]υτου εν κυμαλεις φιλαλαγμος; in our text there is only room

for one word. As the line, except for the last word, is identical with the preceding the scribe probably
contented himself with writing ενιτε.
18 THEOLOGICAL TEXTS (GREEK)

463. THE GOSPEL OF MARY.

Acquired in 1917. Oxyrhynchus. 8 9 x 9 9 cm. Early third century. PLATE 1.

A happy chance and the kindness of Professor Carl Schmidt have enabled the identity of this leaf from a papyrus codex—which I had formerly classed among the nameless apocrypha not uncommon in the papyri—to be established beyond any doubt. A first reading of this fragment of a ‘Gospel’, which consists mainly of a dispute between Mary Magdalene and some of the apostles who denied that her account of the teaching of the Saviour was true, made it clear that it aligned itself not with any of the historic or quasi-historic narratives of the life of Christ but with those works of early Christian literature which impose on a framework of narrative a superstructure of esoteric teaching. The use of σαρήν to the exclusion of all other names for our Lord suggested a Gnostic origin for the work,1 which was confirmed by the prominence assigned to Mary Magdalene in the fragment and the hostility her position aroused in the disciples. One of the characteristics of Gnostic teaching was the importance, in theory and practice, attached to women; and among the arid theosophical wastes of the Pistis Sophia are several incidents which recalled the quarrel recorded in our papyrus. Thus in Bk. I. 36 (57)2 Peter complains that Mary is usurping the disciples’ place and speaks too much, and again, in II. 72 (161) Mary complains that Peter has threatened her and hates the sex; elsewhere Mary is prominent as a questioner of Jesus, and near the end of the book (IV. 132 (342)) the Saviour ‘proclaimed her blessed again and again’. In II. 100 Andrew, who also appears in our text, is specially rebuked for ignorance. This question of the importance of Mary Magdalene in the Gnostic writings is discussed at some length by Professor Schmidt in the introduction (p. lxxxvii) to his edition of the Pistis Sophia (Leipzig, 1923), and a quotation from the unpublished Coptic text of the Gospel of Mary in a Berlin papyrus of the fifth century provided the clue to the identity of our papyrus. The passage is worth quoting as it illustrates the background of our fragment. Professor Schmidt writes (p. lxxxviii):


1 See note to 1. 4.
2 References are to the English translation by G. R. S. Mead, 2nd edition (London, 1921); the reader may also be referred to the literal translation by George Horner (London, 1954).
463. THE GOSPEL OF MARY

du dich erinnerst, diese, die du kennst, nicht wir, noch haben wir sie gehört”. Maria erklärt sich bereit, das Verborgene ihnen zu verkündigen und trägt den Inhalt eines Traumgeschichtes vor, dessen sie vom Erlöser teilhaft geworden war.

At this point 463 takes up the story, and after describing, with a gap of some lines, the dispute among the disciples, ends with their resolution to go and preach ‘The Gospel according to Mary’.

A copy of 463 was sent to Professor Schmidt, who confirmed the identity of the papyrus, and very kindly supplied me with the translation of the Coptic text (in which the Greek words in the original are retained) which is printed below. This has not only made it possible to restore the correct reading at points where the Greek text was mutilated or corrupt and place it in its proper context, but also provides an interesting basis for a comparison between the two versions. The differences between the two are more numerous than we might expect; occasionally (see notes to ll. 11 and 30) they are probably due to corruption in the Greek text; but this does not account for the absence in Professor Schmidt’s translation of the Coptic (henceforth referred to as S) of ll. 14 sq. in the Greek, or for its different handling of ll. 19-20. Another point of some interest which emerges from the comparison is that even when the Coptic text employs Greek words, these are by no means always represented in the Greek original, e.g. γυναῖκας when the Greek has σωφρόνεις, in l. 20. Another result is that, as the pages of the Greek are numbered and as S gives us approximately the extent of the gap between the two sides, we can calculate the length of this initial section of the Gospel, the beginning of which is lost in the Coptic; this preface probably occupied some 480 lines, and just where our text ends, the Gospel proper, the esoteric teaching of whatever Gnostic sect produced the work, begins.

There would seem to be little doubt that the Gospel of Mary was one of the oldest Gnostic documents and probably was already in existence when Irenaeus was writing. From it quite probably derives the tradition which ascribes such importance to Mary Magdalene and which gave rise to the works known as ‘The Greater’ and ‘The Lesser Questions of Mary’. Further, as Professor Schmidt points out (op. cit., p. lxxxvii), the important part played by women in Pistis Sophia is not peculiar to Bks. I-III; it is no less conspicuous in Bk. IV, which is a separate work. Hence we are justified in looking for a common source for these incidents or passages of a narrative rather than a speculative character scattered throughout Pistis Sophia; and the most likely source, as Professor Schmidt points out, is the Ἑβαγγέλιον κατὰ Μαρία. 463 further supports Professor Schmidt’s hypothesis that Gnostic or Christian works written in Coptic are only translations from Greek originals; in this case, the existence of a Greek text at such an early date is conclusive evidence.

Needless to say, no incident in any of the four canonical Gospels recalls even remotely the scene described in this fragment. It is, however, probable enough that Luke xxiv. 10, where, after the Crucifixion, the disciples refuse to believe the women’s story of the empty tomb, and John xx. 18, where Mary Magdalene relates to the disciples what Jesus said to her at the tomb, provided Gnostic writers—who wished both to give some slight air of

1 Die Urschrift der Pistis Sophia in Ztschr. für die NT. Wissenschaft, 24 (1925), p. 218 sq.
verisimilitude to their theosophic revelations and at the same time to emphasize the importance of women in the New Testament story—with a starting-point for their work. Further, the writer of this apocryphal work is very slightly indebted to the N.T. for his vocabulary; a few parallelisms have been pointed out in the notes, but, with the doubtful adaptation of St. Paul's words in l. 27, they can all be explained as being part of the common stock of Christian writers. The author's style is remarkably plain and almost crude, and suggests that his acquaintance with literary Greek, even perhaps with Christian literature, was not extensive, and that the work was not intended for a cultivated audience. It should, however, be remembered that the text given us in the papyrus is obviously an inferior one, and the divergencies from S suggest that a different, and perhaps better, Greek version may have been in circulation.

The text is written in a hand which, if clear and upright, is also ugly and ill-proportioned, and shows considerable cursive influence. It is singularly plain and has no peculiarities except the tendency to height in certain letters—κ, υ, ι, ρ. It bears a very close resemblance to P. Oxy. VIII. 1100, an edict of Subatianus Aquila dated in A.D. 206, although ε is more rounded in the latter and ο larger; of this hand the editor remarks that it approximates to the literary type, and being accurately dated, is of palaeographical interest. Another hand with which it has affinities is P. Oxy. VI. 853 (= Schubart, Pal., Abb. 86), a Thucydidean commentary, probably written sometime during the second century. 463 can hardly be later than the middle of the third century, and probably is considerably earlier. The scribe was not a careful copyist; in ll. 6-7 he has repeated two words without crossing them out and—not to mention more serious faults in the MS.—in l. 27 he has failed to supply an omitted letter. Of the usual theological contractions only ἄνῳ for ἄνῃρον ὄνος is found in l. 27; the only other nomen sacrum to occur is σωρίφ which, as not infrequently (e.g. in P. Oxy. 1081), is left uncontracted. In l. 25 τ has been omitted in the middle of a word and a line drawn over the preceding vowel. The scribe used a smooth breathing once, in l. 19, and a misplaced accent in l. 23; the diaeresis is found twice, in ll. 6 and 14. For punctuation a high point is employed twice, in ll. 2 and 9; it does not occur where we should expect it, at the end of Mary's speech in l. 18. To judge from S, some eight or ten lines have been lost after l. 15, so that a column of writing would have measured c. 7.5 x 12 cm. Recto precedes verso, and as, before being folded, the sheets of papyrus were generally laid with the recto side uppermost with the result that verso preceded recto in the first half of the quire, it is probable that our leaf came from the second half of a quire, and that the codex consisted of several quires.

The small strip which comprises the outer side of the leaf was in a small packet with a few other literary fragments, the provenance of all of which was definitely stated to be Oxyrhynchus. It was not until later that I came across the main fragment of the leaf in a separate folder to which no provenance was assigned. There is no reason to doubt that the origin of the text is Oxyrhynchus. Above l. 1 and to the right of the numeration are some ink marks, which may be the traces of some letters in a cursive hand; but the scribe has been careless with his pen in more places than one.

For valuable corrections and supplements of the text I wish to thank Mr. P. L. Hedley and Mr. J. W. B. Barns.
κα

το λουτρὸν δρόμου καθέρνει χρόνου
αἰγῶν αναπαύσεων ἔρχεται ταύτα
τῶν ἑκατέρων 

καὶ τὸ πρὶ τῶν: λαλήσαντος εγὼ μεν
gar on τι παρείτω τῷ ἔρχεται σίω

τῆρα εἰρήκειν' εδοκεὶ γὰρ εἴτε

καὶ τὸ πρὶ τῶν: εἰς τὰν ἔρχεται

τῆρα εἰρήκειν' εδοκεὶ γὰρ εἴτε

καὶ τὸ πρὶ τῶν: εἰς τὰν ἔρχεται

τῆρα εἰρήκειν' εδοκεὶ γὰρ εἴτε

καὶ τὸ πρὶ τῶν: εἰς τὰν ἔρχεται

τῆρα εἰρήκειν' εδοκεὶ γὰρ εἴτε

καὶ τὸ πρὶ τῶν: εἰς τὰν ἔρχεται

τῆρα εἰρήκειν' εδοκεὶ γὰρ εἴτε
THE TRANSLATION.

(Translato) '... for the rest of my course of the ages of time I shall find rest in silence'. When she had spoken thus Mary held her peace, for thus far had the Saviour spoken. Andrew says, 'Brethren, what think ye of that which has been said? For my part I do not believe that thy Saviour said this. For it seems to differ in spirit from his thoughts.' (Peter says) 'Did thy Saviour when he was questioned concerning these matters speak privity to a woman and (not) openly, that we all might hear something of more note . . .'

(Verse) 'think you concerning) the Saviour?' Levi says to Peter, 'Peter, thy angry temper is ever with thee and even now thou questionest thus the woman as though thou wast her adversary. Rather let us be ashamed and putting on the perfect man let us do that which was commanded unto us, namely to preach the Gospel neither making rules nor laying down laws other (than the) Saviour has said.' When he had spoken thus, Levi departed, and began to preach the Gospel according to Mary . . .

THE COPTIC VERSION.3

Als die ψυχή ausser Wirksamkeit gesetzt (entkräftet) die dritte ἐξουσία, ging sie nach oben und sah die vierte ἐξουσία. Sie machte aus sieben μορφή. Die erste μορφή ist die Finsternis, die zweite die ἐνθυμία, die dritte die Unwissenheit, die vierte ist die Einsicht, die fünfte ist das Reich des θάνατος, die sechste ist die törichte Klugheit (Einsicht) der θάνατος, die siebente ist die zornige (wütende) θεία. Dies sind die sieben ἐξουσία der ἂνθρωπος, die befragen die ψυχή: Von wem komme ich, von eioem Menschenmörderin, oder (ὁ) wohin gehst du, du Oeiter-Entkraftende? Es antwortete die ψυχή und sprach: 'Der, welcher mich erfasst, ist durchstossen von der Klugheit (Einsicht) des θάνατος. Ich weinte Maria und sprach zu

Es antwortete Levi und sprach zu Petrus: 'Mein Bruder Petrus, was denkst du? Denkst du, dass ich es auserwählte habe allein in meinem Herzen (bei mir) oder (ὁ) dass ich in Bezug auf den σωτήρ läge?'

Es antwortete Levi und sprach zu Petrus: 'Peter, von jeher bist du ein Jähzorniger. Jetzt sehe ich dich, wie du wettkampfst (γνωρίζεις) gegen das Weib nach Art der ἀντικείμενοι. Wenn der σωτήρ de sic σέβαι erachtet hat, wer άλλος bist du, sie άναθεμα zu verwerfen. Da der σωτήρ sie διαφέρει καθά, deswegen hat er sie mehr geliebt als uns. μάλλον mögen wir uns schämen und anziehen den τίμωρα Menschen und uns zu bereiten, wie (καθός) er uns befördert und verkünden (predigen) das σιαγγέλεια, indem wir keine andere ὑπό noch (οὖδέ) andere ὑμεῖς auferlegen neben dem (νόμο), was der σωτήρ gesagt hat.'

Als sie ... dieses, da begannen (ἀρχήθαι) sie zu gehen, [damit sie] verkündeten und predigten das εὐαγγέλιον kath Máthai.

1. It may be noted that in the Coptic text Καρός and χριστὸς have changed places; it is strange that ἀνάπαυσις should be so far from the verb which governs it and that ἀγαπημένεν should be unrepresented in the Coptic. Very probably the verb corresponding to εὐφημίσθη in S was εὐφημίσθη: cf. Math. xi. 29 εὐφημίσθη ἀνάπαυσις ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν—and the Second Epistle of Clement, vi νοθείτε γάρ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Χριστοῦ εὐφημίσθην ἀνάπαυσιν.

1 To place the fragment in its context, the preceding paragraph is also given.
3. Μαριμωμ: this form of the name Μαρία or Μαρίνα, though not found in the LXX or in the N.T., is
common in Josephus.
4. Here S—as though the Saviour had spoken so far with her—seems to be an improvement on the
Greek.
5. . . επιραστος. This use of σωρις is alien to the canonical Gospels, where the word is used of Him
only twice (Luke ii. 11 and John iv. 42), and in neither case as a descriptive label, as it is here. It may be
noted that Irenaeus (i. 1, 1) criticizes the Valentinian Gnostics for using it to the exclusion of κληρον.
Though not confined to them, it was the common way of referring to Jesus among the Gnostics; it is also
regularly used in P. Oxy. 840, a dialogue between Jesus and a Pharisee on the difference between real and
ritual purity.
6. τις πίστις ἡς: this expression is regularly used in St. Matthew's Gospel to introduce a question put to
the disciples by Jesus.
8. σωτήριον: the phrase is peculiar, if not corrupt, and is not supported by S, but no other reading is
possible.
9. έκτρογιματισμος: I owe the supplement to Professor Schubart. έκτρογιματισμος does not appear in the
new Liddell and Scott, but is found in Cyril of Alexandria, i. 540 a. With the supplement in the next line S
does not help much; that given in the text does not, however, conflict with S. It is clear that this sentence,
which ends with επιραστος, is not comment by the author, but a part of Andrew's speech: εκτροσ in must refer
to Jesus. εννοια was a terminus technicus among the Barbelo-Gnostics (cf. Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. i. 27), the
sect to whom Πίτις Σοφία may be ascribed, but can hardly be used in that sense here.
11. In S this speech is ascribed to Peter, and II. 18-19 of 463 presume that Peter has been the speaker.
We must suppose that one (or following S, at least two) lines have dropped out of the Greek at this point;
the question certainly begins very abruptly with πίστις Σοφία. Alternatively, 463 may merely have placed
Peter's intervention a little later and so have given the first sentence of his speech to Andrew.
13. Here and in the following lines, the Greek diverges considerably from S. και φασαθερίος is very
probably corrupt (cf. the nicht offen of S, which gives excellent sense). The subsequent sentence appears to
be unrepresented in S.
18. του σωτήριος: governed by some such phrase as φευγόμαι περιου, cf. S.
Matthew is referred to as Levi without further qualification in the N.T. only in Luke v. 27-9.
19. The mark over the first σ of σσις is too deliberate to be a casual blot; as it is distinct from the accent
over σις in l. 23, it can hardly be anything except a smooth breathing.
19-20. Here again 463 diverges from S, which gives a rather free translation.
θρισμός is used of a person in Tit. i. 7; for παρακινεῖται cf. Rom. vii. 21 ἐγὼ τὸ καθὼς παράκινεται.
σωματεία: this word, not infrequent in the N.T., is used most frequently by Mark. It is remarkable
that the Coptic has γυμνάκιος, never found in the N.T. in the sense required by S, 'contend against'.
23. The misplaced accent over σις is not easy to account for. In speaking, the stress would naturally fall
on this word, which might explain the presence of the accent. In the Coptic παντείας clearly goes with the
preceding words, whereas here it must be the first word of a new sentence.
24. σφαλμεν [σφαλμεν] which according to S should belong to εννοία must be taken with ημετέρας; this slightly
improves the sense. For the sentiment cf. John xi. 5 ἡμᾶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν Μάρθαν καὶ τὴν ἄδελφην αὐτῆς καὶ
tὴν Λάζαρον.
27. For τελειος (also in the Coptic) cf. Col. i. 28 (with ἀνθρωπός), Eph. iv. 13 (with ὑπόν). 
28. Here again 463 differs from S, though not so seriously as before.
29-30. Without the guidance of S (indem wir keine andere ὅποι nach (οὐδὲ) andere νόμος aufgelesen neben
dem (παρόδο), was der σωρις gesagt hat) this peculiar passage would remain obscure. As it is, the text in l. 30
is probably corrupt; the simplest emendation would be to read άλλος (γι) ειπεν. It is possible, however, that
the text is correct and that the reference is to such a passage as Luke xii. 14 τίς με κατέστρεψε κριτή 
μερισθήν ἐπ' ὑμᾶς, and that S represents a simplification.
31-2. Here S partly fails us; it seems to have differed slightly from the text of 468.
464. APOCRYPHAL GOSPEL (?).

Acquired in 1917.  

The recto of this papyrus was used for an official document of some kind, to judge from the type of hand—heavy, rounded and regular; the spacing between the lines is considerable and the letters large, so that not enough survives for identification. The hand is of an official type common in the early third century (cf. Schubart, Palaeographie, Abb. 47, an edict of Caracalla, and Papyri Graecae Berolinenses, 32 b). [At some later period the verso was used for the Christian literary text—perhaps an apocryphal gospel—written in a small, sloping book-hand, probably not later than the middle of the century. In the small amount of text preserved there does not appear to be any reminiscence of the gospels; but it is too fragmentary to allow any inferences to be drawn about the character of the work. The line drawn below 1. ii presumably marks the end of a chapter or section. The only contraction to be noticed is ω in l. 12; σωτήρ (if correctly read in l. 9) remains unabbreviated, as in 463.] For the text on the verso, printed below, see Addenda and Corrigenda.

2. κρησεύω is not found in the participle in the N.T.

6. Neither μοῖρα (if that is the word here) nor any of its compounds occur in the N.T.

7. κανόν = measure, rule is used several times by St. Paul; but the word might also be the contracted genitive of κανά, κανά, basket. It is possible (cf. ἀρπαγμός in l. 2 and τάσσεται in l. 8) that in this passage there was some version of the feeding of the multitude.


14. The apostrophe was probably placed, as was usual at this period, after the first letter either of ἡ or τ.
465. LITURGY OF ST. MARK.

Acquired in 1917.  
13.2 x 19 cm.  
Sixth century.

A sheet of parchment which has been cut down, probably in ancient times to enable it to be more easily folded; it has been folded twice longways and three times across, and was probably worn as an amulet (the small holes may have been made for string to pass through). It was never part of a codex, as the writing on the verso is in the reverse direction to that on the recto. The main text, which is written in a good, slanting hand, in general appearance not unlike that of the Aphroditon Menander (Schubert, Pal., Abb. 99), contains part of the Anaphora according to the liturgy of St. Mark in the Alexandrian rite; the second text, written in a crude and more upright hand of the same period, is a prayer for the departed, probably from the same liturgy.

The liturgy of St. Mark (or, as it is also called, of Alexandria) is preserved in a Coptic version and in Greek MSS., none of which are earlier than the twelfth century and which represent a later recension than that on which the Coptic version is based; a Latin translation of the Coptic version is given side by side with the version found in three Byzantine codices (the Codex Rossanensis, the Rotulus Vaticanus, and the Rotulus Messanensis) in C. A. Swainson, The Greek Liturgies (Cambridge, 1884), pp. 1 sqq. As might be expected, the text in the parchment (which may have been written for use in church) differs very considerably from the later versions; and it is interesting to find that on several occasions (e.g. ll. 23, 24, 26) 465 agrees with the Coptic against the Byzantine versions, while in other places its text is at variance with that of both the Coptic and Byzantine versions. The most notable difference is the very abbreviated form of the Epiclesis found in the parchment (a form which, according to Mr. Ratcliff, suggests that the whole text is no older than the later fourth century) and the omission of the prayer for forgiveness (see note to l. 25) which is preserved in the Coptic version. 465 clearly does not represent a very careful text, and is not free from error; but it may be assumed that it is nearer to the original than the text of any of the existing MSS. Attention has been drawn to the more important differences in the notes, and the ends of the lines have been supplied partly from the Coptic version (C), partly from the Byzantine MSS. (codd.), as given in Swainson. The orthography throughout is very corrupt; some, however, of the mis-spellings have been corrected by the first hand, also responsible for the punctuation.

The second text appears to be based (as Mr. Ratcliff pointed out to me) upon the original Greek intercession for the departed; in the Greek version of the Liturgy of St. Mark this is found in an abbreviated form (Swainson, op. cit., pp. 40–2), which bears little verbal resemblance to our text. The Coptic version (translated in F. A. Brightman, Liturgies Eastern and Western, I, p. 170) is closer, but the two are by no means identical. On this Mr. Ratcliff writes: 'The position of this petition is interesting. In the liturgy it precedes Consecration. Its position here after Consecration recalls the εἰς τὴν προσφοράν ουτ
Serapion, which follows a fashion of devotion set by the practice commended by Cyril of Jerusalem, who says that the prayer offered at this moment for the departed is a μεγίστη ὁμιλία to him. The Copts preserve two liturgies, “St. Basil” and “St. Gregory”, which follow Jerusalem practice in placing a complete intercession after Consecration, and thus abandon the Alexandrian tradition as represented by St. Mark. The significance of this whole fragment to the original owner lay, I should think, in this petition for the departed and in its position (which may explain why the original sheet was cut down to form an amulet).

Recto (hair-side).

οληθος πλησης γαρ εστιν [α] ὁ ουρανος και η γη της αγιας σου δοξης
τι στουν κυριου και θεου και σωθης ημων Ιησου Χριστουν πληρωσον
ο θεους και ταυτη θυσια της παρα σου ευλογιας δια του αγιου σου
πισευματος οτι αυτος ο κυριος και θεος και σωθη και παμβασιλευς ημων

Verso (flesh-side).

και του ανθρωπου του αυτου του αιωνος και του αιωνος του αιωνος και του αιωνος του αιωνος
LITURGY OF ST. MARK

1. πλήρης; 2. 1. διά...σωθήσω. τῶν καὶ τῶν...οὐκ Π.; so elsewhere. 4. πιστός Ρ. 5. 1. παρεδόθην.
6. 1. τῶν. 8. 1. χειρῶν αὐτολύγας. 10. 1. μαθηταίς...εὐδών. 11. 1. καυσί. 12. 1. ἠφέσει. 13. 1. τὸ
δευτέρον...ποτήριον. 14. 1. τοῦ δίδωσι...μαθηταῖς. 15. 1. ἀβία. 16. 1. ἐκχυνδόμενον...διδόμενον. 17. 1. δοκεῖ.
18. 1. ἔμαθεν. 19. 1. ἔμεν...διαλογίστη. 21. 1. ἐδόθεν...δευτέραν. 22. 1. κρίσι. 28. 1. πολη. 29. 1. αἷμα καυσι. 30. 1. βασιλέας. ἐνεσιν οὐκ Ρ. 31. 1. ἴδιων. 32. 1. ἐπανακώσισι. 33. 1. οἰκοδομήσει.
34. 1. τοῦτον καθὼς...δοξάσθη. 35. 1. ἐστιμών. 40. 1. πίστει. 45. 1. ἐκαγγέλων.
1. Vero pleni sunt caeli C: πλήρης γάρ ἐστιν ὅληθος οἱ σφραγῖν Cod. Ross., Rot. Vat.: om. ἐστιν οἱ
Rot. Mess.
2. Add. τὴς ἑπιφανείας after ἐδα codd. Per filium tuum unigenitum C.
3. Perhaps ταύτην (τῶν) θυσίων. Probably there is not room for this in the epiphaniass (per illeum super
illud C.)
4. This form of contraction for πεισμάτος, though not so frequent as πιστός, is not unknown, see L. Traube,
Nomina Sacra, p. 94.
6. Two of the MSS. add σαρι after θάνατον, for which there would probably be room in our text;
C has propriu sua volantate.
7. Possibly οἱ θέατριαν instead of οἱ θέατρον, with Rot. Mess.; C has in manus suas sanctas, immaculatas,
puras, beatas, et victoriantes.
10. τοῖς ἄγιοι καὶ μακάριοι αὐτῆς μαθηταῖς codd.: apostolos puris C. The supplement ek tōn panta is
based on C; the words do not appear in the codd.
11. τῆς καυσι διαθήκη: these words are out of place here and should come after τὸ αἷμα in l. 15. The
scribe attempted to insert the proper words τὸ ἐν τῷ ἄγιῳ κλήμενον καὶ διδόμενον (or an analogous expression)
above the line; but the ink is too faded to determine what he wrote. Between the κ and the α there are
certain traces of one letter.
The supplement περὶ τολλῶν is taken from C's pro multis; the words are absent from the codd. as are
also the words τοῦτο...αὐτοῦ in the next line
13. The words καὶ κράτος ἐξ ὦνων καὶ θόρου, which come in the codd. after ποτήριον and are also
represented in C, were omitted from our text. It agrees with C in omitting here the αὐτολύγας εἰς τὸν
σφραγῖν κτλ. of I. 8, which is repeated in the codd. and also omits the et benedixit eum et sanctificavit eum et
gustavit of C.
17. The supplement in this line is unusually long and it is probable that the scribe omitted τὸν or τοῖς.

19. The scribe has omitted at least δύως οὗ διὸ δένω after διαλογεῖτε.

20. In these lines the version of the parchment is considerably abbreviated.

21. Here the parchment agrees with the orbem of C, against the θεῖας καὶ δικούς of the codd.

22. Here again the parchment agrees with C which reads after secundum opera sua, sive bonum sive malum; these latter words are not represented in the codd.

23. After εὐφιλιῶν σου C has a prayer of some length for the forgiveness of sins, which is not found in the codd., and was clearly also absent from the parchment.

24. The text of the Epiclesis in the parchment is only a quarter the length of that in either C or the codd.

25. Before super hunc panem C has super hunc veneranda dona proposita coram te, to which nothing to correspond is found in the codd.; clearly it or something similar stood in the parchment, but the parchment is so faded at this point that the participle employed cannot be read. Perhaps τοιοῦτον, 'which thou seest here', might be read, as Mr. Ratcliff suggests: but it cannot be verified.

26. Before super hunc panem C has super hunc veneranda dona proposita coram te, to which nothing to correspond is found in the codd.

27. The latter part of this line was left blank.

28. The supplement here is based on C's corpus Christi; in the codd. óμω stands alone.

29. καὶ ἀφανοῦς is probably misplaced; it should go in the preceding line after αὐτων.

30. Mr. Ratcliff tentatively proposed αἰτεῖνον here, and thinks it might have been suggested by the δικού καὶ δικαίων of the introductory dialogue; but I can find no instance of this word. We should expect εἰς δοξολογίαν τω αὐτω σου αὐτοῦ.

35-6. πανεῖος: πανεῖον suggests itself, but does not appear in the lexicon. Possibly πανεῖον might be read. πανεῖον would make l. 34 rather too long.

36. The text of the parchment is confused at this point. εἰς αὐτῆς αὐτοῦ should precede the clause beginning ἐν σοῦ in l. 33. Owing to its intrusion here it is quite uncertain whether the parchment read ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ αὐτῷ Παντέλειμνων, with C and the codd.

37. It is not clear to what the words at the end of l. 36 refer; they do not appear to be part of the prayer which follows in the MSS.

38. ἔτερον: ἐκλησία seem the most plausible restoration, but obliges us to assume that εἰς has fallen out before τῶν. For the supplement to the line see Brightman, op. cit., p. 169, 34.

40. Perhaps supply καὶ αἰτήσεις κοιμήσω, see Brightman, loc. cit.

41-2. Brightman, op. cit., 170, 12 = Isaiah, xxxv. 10.


45-7 = 1 Cor. ii. 9.

466. TWO BYZANTINE HYMNS.1

Acquired in 1920. Fayūm. 22·6 x 11·9 cm. Seventh century. Plate I.

The two hymns which constitute the main content of this sheet of papyrus are of the type known as canons (or, more strictly, τροπάρια, nine of which composed a κανών), the predominant form taken by the hymn in the middle Byzantine period; the canon is described by A. Baumstark (art. 'Hymns (Greek Christian)', in Hastings, Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, 7, p. 9) as follows: 'The canon . . . is a mode in which the singing of troparia is combined with all the Biblical songs recited in Matins, the short and unvarying

1 For identifying the genus of these texts, for the metrical reconstruction, and for the substance of this introduction, I am deeply indebted to Dr. G. Zuntz and, through him, to Professor Höeg who co-operated with him. See also Addenda et Corrigenda.
hypopsalma of an earlier day giving place to poetical strophes of considerable length and of the same metrical structure. That they belong to this type is clear from their relation to the eighth and ninth Biblical Odes; these, regularly sung at Matins, comprise eight songs from the Old Testament and one from the New, the latter consisting of the Magnificat and the Benedictus; to each a τροπάριον was attached and a series of such τροπάρια formed a κανών. Each contains three strophes, as is usual with Byzantine canons, of the same metrical structure; the first one, A, has, as was not uncommon, a theotokion attached to it.

These hymns represent a primitive stage of the development of the canon, and consequently are of some importance for the history of Byzantine literary forms; they form a link between the earlier Christian hymns and the later more highly developed and more sophisticated hymnology of the Byzantine age. The invention of the canon is commonly attributed to Andreas of Crete (675-740), although its existence in the fifth and sixth centuries is attested by at least three independent witnesses (see W. Christ-M. Paranikas, Anthologia Graeca Carminum Christianorum (Leipzig, 1871), pp. xxix sq.). Christ and Paranikas (op. cit., p. xxxv) would delete the mention of the word κανών in these passages as a later addition; but it seems more probable that in parts of the Greek East, in Egypt at least, the canon had been known long before it was developed and standardized by Andreas in the eighth century. This view is strongly supported by 466; for even if it is dated as late as the eighth century, we can hardly suppose that the invention of Andreas would have found its way, in his lifetime, to an Egyptian provincial church at a time when Egypt was under Arab domination. Further, the irregularities both of the text and of its arrangement, and the crude style of the hymns, as contrasted with the work of Andreas, certainly do not suggest that the canon, in its finished form, had recently been introduced from outside Egypt.

With a few alterations—justified by the corrupt state of the text, which in places, e.g. in ll. 8 and 14, needs considerable emendation to give any sense at all—the text of the two hymns can be reduced to a metrical scheme. Each consists of three strophes; in both each strophe begins with the same words (in A with a doxology, in B with Σέρε); in both each strophe ends with a refrain, and the statements between the initial word or words and the refrain are invariably in the form of participial clauses. The refrains (ὑπακοή or εφόμενα) were probably sung by the congregation; they are a characteristic feature of early Christian (and so probably Jewish, see Christ-Paranikas, op. cit., p. xvi) poetry, and are to be found e.g. in the Parthenaion of Methodius (Christ-Paranikas, op. cit., p. 33) and in P. Ryl. 7 (see also Constitutiones Apostolorum (ed. Funk), ii. 57, 6). What is unusual is to find, together with the refrain, the system of identical words at the beginning of strophes. The metrical principle is that of syllabic equality; no importance is laid on the distribution of accents; hiatus, and some variation in the caesura, are allowed. The scheme of A is 8:12:12:10 (with a possible exception in the first line of the theotokion); that of B is 10:10:7. (For metrical purposes the refrain does not count as a part of the strophe; τέσσερα, it should be noticed, is dissyllabic throughout.)

These two hymns do not appear to be preserved elsewhere; but among the canons attributed to St. John Damascene is a small group of poems which, both in structure and
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style—they are less theological and simpler in phrasing than the rest—bear some resemblance to our texts. They are the last three odes of the canon sung at Matins during Ascension (Christ-Paranikas, op. cit., pp. 227–8), of which the ninth may be quoted:

Σὲ τὸν λυτρωτὴν τοῦ κόσμου, Χριστὸν τῶν Θεῶν,
οἱ ἀπόστολοι βλέποντες ἐνθέως υψώμενον
μετὰ δέως σκαρπάντες ημεταλύμενοι.

Σὲ τὸν καταβάντα ἔως ἐσχάτον τῆς γῆς,
καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων σῶσαντα καὶ τῇ ἀναβάσει σου
ἀνυψώσαντα, τούτῳ μεγαλύνομεν.

Χαῖρε, Θεότοκε μήτερ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ,
διὶ ἐκσήμαν, σήμερον εἰ γῆς ἀναπάντευν
σῶν ἄγγελοι ὅρωσα ημεταλύμενα.

and with the first verse of A the first verse of the seventh ode may be compared:

ὁ ἐν καρπῷ πυρὸς | τοὺς ἡμινόροις σῶσας παῖδας
εὐλογηθῇ ὁ θεὸς, ὁ τῶν πατέρων ἠμῶν.

We may perhaps conclude that St. John Damascene embodied in his collection some extant hymns reflecting the simpler piety of an earlier age. The theotokion which forms the fourth strophe of A also appears to be new; but theotokia of this type from the ἠμῶν ἀκαθίστος onwards (Christ-Paranikas, op. cit., p. 146) are numerous (cf. Paracleitice (Venice, 1851), pp. 103, 108, 194; for the ἔλεγχος στράτα see Christ-Paranikas, op. cit., p. 85, &c.); and there are two in the canons of St. John Damascene which bear a general resemblance to ours and which also preserve metrical correspondence with the preceding strophes (Christ-Paranikas, op. cit., pp. 233 and 235).

It is difficult to determine the occasion for which these hymns were intended, since it is not explicitly stated (as we might expect it to be) in the headings. That they were related to the eighth and ninth Biblical Odes respectively there need be no doubt; the heading of A explicitly refers to the eighth Biblical ode and that of B—eis τὸ μεγαλύνει τὴν ὑψηλότεραν τῶν χερουβίων—in all probability to the ninth. The final words look like a reference to the well-known stanza (quoted in full in note on 1. 22) of which the first line is: τὴν τριμοντέραν τῶν χερουβίων. This stanza is known as the εἰρήμος (the typical strophe used as a model for a series) of the ἀκολουθία τῶν παθῶν for Good Friday (Triodion (Venice, 1748), p. 387), and is ascribed to Cosmas of Majuma, the friend of St. John Damascene. It is, however, often found separated from its context, and was used on many occasions, as a rule without the rest of the canon, e.g. it is occasionally given at the end of the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom (F. E. Brightman, Eastern Liturgies, p. 399; see also Goar, Euchologion (Paris, 1647), p. 78, § 141 and, for the Hours at Christmas, Menaion (Rome, 1888), pp. 635, 638, 643, &c.). Numerous variations of the text are found; but none of them is identical with the heading of B. Two explanations are possible. Either

1 Equally striking as a parallel to our texts are some other canons also preserved in the same writer's Octoechos (Venice, 1883) and also, almost certainly, earlier hymns which he took over and adapted for his collection; n.b. those for the seventh, eighth, and ninth odes, p. 105 sq.
the scribe of B wrote setScale<56>ψηλοτέραν in mistake for .setScale<56>τιμωτέραν, in which case we must infer that Cosmas took as the eἰπὼς of his ode an already existing troparion. Alternatively, we may suppose that the version given in B is correct, in which case some stanza very close to that of Cosmas (and which also converted the words of the Magnificat to the praise of the Virgin herself) must have served as his model. In either case there is this difference between the two hymns, that while in A the eἰπὼς is given in full, in B it is only indicated.

But there is some internal evidence as to the occasion of these hymns. As the nine Biblical Odes were regularly sung at Matins in the Byzantine rite (cf. Simeon of Thessalonica in Migne, P. G. 155, 640 c–d), we may assume that our hymns accompanied them on some occasion or other. A further limitation may be possible. The basis of A is the story of the Three Children in the Fiery Furnace; this lends itself to many varieties of allegoric interpretation, but here it is to be noticed that the author, after devoting one stanza to the original subject, passes on to the Crucifixion and the Resurrection, which also form the principal theme of B. Two explanations may be suggested; either the hymns were part of a Sunday canon, since from the earliest times (see Const. Ap. viii. 33, 2) Sunday was set aside for the commemoration of the Resurrection; or else, since the Crucifixion as well as the Resurrection is alluded to, they might be part of an Easter canon, either at Matins or at the night service on the Saturday when the Song of the Three Children was always sung. It may be noted that the hymns are definitely monophysite in tone; cf. II. 6–8 where the language is reminiscent of the phrase added to the Trisagion by Peter the Fuller, ὁ σταυροθείς δὲ ημᾶς (see art. ‘Monophysites’ in Hastings, Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, 8, p. 813; also note ad loc.).

II. 17–19, which follow immediately on A, and I. 34, after B, may be explained as incipits of other hymns, which were perhaps connected in the scribe’s mind with A and B, but which for some reason he did not continue. The lines written on the verso at right angles to the rest of the text may be part of a hymn in honour of St. Theodore Stratelates; but I have been unable to identify them. The text is written throughout in a heavy and sloping semi-cursive (not unlike that of Schubart, Papyri Graecae Berolinenses, 48b), most probably to be assigned to the seventh century, though a later date cannot absolutely be excluded. The writing on the verso runs in the opposite direction to that on the recto, i.e. the sheet was turned upside down before the verso was written; hence the papyrus was not part of a codex but a single sheet, probably used, as was P. Amh. 9, as a choir slip. The lower part of the sheet at least is a palimpsest; on the recto a few Greek letters or figures are visible, on the verso are traces of half obliterated Arabic writing, though not enough to indicate the nature of the text. (The two lines of figures at the bottom of the recto text are in the same ink and hand as the preceding text; their purpose here is obscure.) The hand is generally clear, although the down strokes are so heavy that e.g. α and η are almost indistinguishable, and there are occasional blot; the orthography, as is perhaps to be expected in a text of this type and of this period, is very slipshod. Nomina sacra are regularly contracted, and the contraction marked by a horizontal

\[1\] For use of it somewhat parallel to that in our text cf. P. Bouriant, 4, 10.

\[2\] Further, the stanza τῷ τιμωτέραν εἰκ. formed the ἱεράμος of the Magnificat at Sunday Matins (see Typikon (1888), p. 544). The resemblance of these hymns to the canons from the Octoechos already mentioned also suggests that they were intended for the ordinary Sunday rite.
line; two of the forms found in this text deserve notice, \( \text{V7JV} \) for \( \text{e}(p'l')V7Jv \), a contraction which does not appear to have occurred before (see L. Traube, *Nomina Sacra*) and \( \text{σω(τη)ριαν} \), also new, although \( \text{σωρα} \) is found in MSS. of the eighth and ninth centuries (Traube, p. 118). The form \( \text{ης} \) for \( \text{Ης(σου)} \) is found not infrequently both in early and late MSS., cf. Traube, pp. 156 sq., and G. Rudberg, *Eranos*, xxxiii, p. 146.

The papyrus was purchased in the Fayûm and so is likely to come from that area; possibly we can define its provenance more exactly. Ll. 36–7 may refer to St. Theodore Stratelates, a popular saint in the Monophysite Church, to whom, as we know from P. Klein. Form. 164, 671, and 702, a church was dedicated in Arsinoë in the sixth and seventh centuries. Hence it is possible that our papyrus was once used as a choir slip in this church.¹

Recto.

\[ + \text{συν } \text{'θεω' εις 'το' ευλογ(ειτε) ηχ(ος) πλ(αγιος) α'} \]

\[ \text{δοξα εις υψιστοις θ(ε)ω του εις Βαβιλωνι εκ} \]

\[ \text{ει σφιστηει ε(ν) φλογο και} \text{ ει τη καημνυ κρασουειν το πυρ ον } \text{ι πετες} \]

5 ἑμονουτ(ες) ελεγον ευλογ(ειτε) τα εργα κυριον

\[ \text{δοξα εις υψιστοις θ(ε)ω του εις τω στ(αν)ρω} \]

\[ \text{προσιλουθετεν εν σαρκι και εκουσους} \]

\[ \text{παθοντα ατι ημας ον οι παιδες εμονου} \]

\[ \text{δοξα εις υψιστοις θ(ε)ω του τριημερου} \]

10 ανασται εκ των νεκρων και εις Γαλαται

\[ \text{λεω σφιστηει μαηθηας ον οι πε} \]

\[ \text{δες εμονου(τες) ελεγον ευλογητα εις εργα κυριον} \]

\[ \text{χαιρε θ(ε)ο(υ)σι(ς) του Π(σωρια)λης χαιρε} \text{νες μητρα} \]

\[ \text{πλατατερα ουραμων χαιρε νησιο} \]

15 τας επουρωθε θρονον οι πε

\[ \text{δες εμονου(τες) ελεγον ευλογ(ειτε) τα εργα κυριον} \]

\[ \text{επεσοθαιν τη(ν) σημερησιν} \]

\[ \text{την αναστασιν Χριστοι Ιησους και} \text{ον} \]

\[ \text{προλαβηση Μαρια} \]

\[ \text{ρσ ... και } \text{ει } \text{κε δ} \]

Verso.

\[ \text{εις το μεγαλουντει την ψηλωτεραιν(ν) του χαιροφων} \]

\[ \text{σε του στ(αν)ρου(ν)εντα κυριον} \text{δια σω(τη)ρια(ν)} \]

\[ \text{πασιν ημον των αιθρω(ν)ων το} \]

25 γενος εις εμονος μεγαλυνομεν

\[ \text{σε τον αναστατα εκ τω(ν) νεκρων} \]

¹ But see *Addenda and Corrigenda*, p. xvii.
καὶ τοις μάθηταις ὤφθηντα θεόν
καὶ ἐξηράνθην διδοντες εν μνημονεύ

30 σε την μακαρία(ν) εν γυναιξίν
καὶ εὐλογισμὸν ου τοι τη(ε)ω
τοιο αὐθαυτὸν το γενος (εν) μνημονεύ μεγα

λυνομεν νω Π ΤΑΙΛΑΤΟΠΟ ΤΟΥ

autos ἄτας κυρίος ενε...

At right angles to the rest of the text, on the left side:

35 ενε... γῆσθι... καὶ λα...
καὶ εὐφρατηλαταις
εὐδαξίας μαρτής
[Χριστοῦ] εἰκ νεκρων εκεκρητί] τριή
μερον ἀπαρχής γεναμενος

40 τοις κενευμήν.

μερεῖς

2. 1 τφ. 3. καμίνι. 4. λ. ἤρωτας. 5. τφ. στὸ τφ. 6. καμίνι. 7. λ. προσηλωθότας. ἔκουσιν.
τοις θείασ. 34. λ. ἐπιαυ. 37. 1 ἐκοφος μάρτυς. 38. 1. Ἴσθεστα. 39. λ. ἀπαρχή. 40. τοῖς γεγονομελέων (see note).

METRICAL TRANSCRIPTION.
(ll. 2-16 and 23-33).

Α

Δόξα ἐν ψιλίστω τοις Θεῷ
τῷ ἐν Βασιλέωι [ταχῦ] ὥθετοι εἰν φλογὶ
kαὶ ἐν τῇ καιμίῳ ἄφοσιν τῷ πύρ
ἐν οἱ παῖδες ἐμοῦσαν ἐλεγον
Εὐλογεῖτε τὸ ἔργα κυρίον.

Δόξα ἐν ψιλίστω τοις Θεῷ
τῷ ἐν {τῷ} σταυρῷ προσηλωθέτων εἰν σαρκὶ
kαὶ ἐκουσίωσι ποδάρα δι(δ) ήμᾶς
ἐν οἱ παῖδες ἐμοῦσαν ἐλεγον
Εὐλογεῖτε τὸ ἔργα κυρίον.

Δόξα ἐν ψιλίστω τοις Θεῷ
τῷ τριμερος ἀναστάτω χ [τῷ] νεκρῶν
καὶ ἐν Γαλλαίᾳ ὥθετοι μαθηταῖς
ἐν οἱ παῖδες ἐμοῦσαν ἐλεγον
Εὐλογεῖτε τὸ ἔργα κυρίον.
THEOLOGICAL TEXTS (GREEK)

Xaipe Theolouc dias vou (to Ypern)
chaire di alyma plastikyn oiprouon
chaire dia epouran évoune
ǒn al paiotes ñμωντες ñleqon
Eilegeite tâ ð̄a kuriou.

II. 1-19. 'With God's help. For the Benedicite, in the first plagal tone.
Glory to God in the highest, to Him that was seen there, in Babylon, in the flame and in the furnace, that quenched the fire, whom the Children praised, saying, 'Bless ye the Lord, ye works of His'.

Glory to God in the highest, to Him who in the flesh was nailed upon the Cross and who of His own will suffered for us, whom the Children praised.

Glory to God in the highest, to Him that after three days rose from the dead and was seen in Galilee of His disciples, whom the Children praised, saying, 'Bless ye the Lord, ye works of His'.

Hail, pure Mother of God, the Holy One of Israel, hail, thou whose womb is greater than the heavens: hail, 0 sanctified one, 0 Throne of the heavens, of Him whom the Children praised, saying, 'Bless ye the Lord, ye works of His'.

They have desired the conversation, the resurrection of Jesus Christ . . .'

II. 22-4. 'For the Magnificat. Her who is higher than the Cherubim . . .

Thee, the Lord who wast crucified for the salvation of us all, we, the race of men, magnify in hymns.

Thee, who didst rise from the dead and wast seen as God of Thy disciples, who givest peace, we magnify in hymns.

Thee, that art blessed among women, whom God hath favoured, we, the race of men, magnify in hymns.

Thyself hast said, Lord . . .'

II. 36-41. 'Thou, among the Captains the glorious martyr . . . after three days didst become the firstfruits of them that had died.'

1. ἔχεις πλάνος αὐ: in full (v. Sophocles, Lexicon, s.v.) ἔχεις πλάνοι τοῦ πρῶτου τῶν.

The reference here is to the Song of the Three Children or Eighth Biblical Ode.

4. τρωσταντι (I. ἤπ): the only meanings given in the lexicon are sprinkle, refresh. Here it must = extinguish, an easy extension of the first meaning. Cf. Daniel iii. 50 καὶ ἐπέκειται τὸ μέσον τῆς καμίου ἀνέλει διαμέρισα, and, for the following words, ibid. 24 καὶ μέσο τῆς φλογες ἐμαυείτε τῶν σέων καὶ εὐλαμάτες τῶν καίμονων, with v. I . . ἔλαμασε καὶ ἐλαμάτες καὶ ἐσάνοντες τῆς διὰ τῆς καμίαν λέγετε κηλ.

7. ἐκουσίως παλιοτίς. Cf. the trope of the Coptic Church for the morning office on Maundy Thursday, printed by Baumstark, Oriens Christianus, 3rd Series, iii (1930), p. 75. l. 3 ὥς ἡ μαρθί καὶ διαντά διὰ τὸ γένος ἡμῶν. Baumstark remarks that this trope is not earlier than the seventh or eighth century, i.e. it may be contemporary with our text.
8. At the end of this line there is no mark of abbreviation after the v: it is probable that a whole line has fallen out, i.e. that the scribe intended to write ἐμοῦντ(ές) ἔλεγον κτλ.

9. Cf. P. Bouriant, 4, 27 (an acrostic hymn): τριημήρας δ' ἑγερθείς of Jonah as a type of Christ. I have regarded τριημήρας here as adverbial; but perhaps we should emend to τριημήραι.


11. Iσφαλή may have been added above aγη by the scribe owing to a confusion between ἄγω and ἄγως (cf. l. 14); it is evident that he did not understand the metre of the hymns he was copying. ἄγη τοῦ ἱσφάλῆ does not appear to be otherwise known; and even if it is regarded as a variant on ἄγως τοῦ ἱσφάλη, the latter would hardly be applied to the Virgin. Probably the words are best deleted.

12. γνωστας. It is not clear what the scribe intended to write here. Possibly he may have had in his mind the ἡγαστὴν τό υἱόν which precedes the lines quoted in the note on l. 13; but no such word as ἡγαστῆς is known to the dictionaries. The metre requires a trisyllabic word, i.e. ἄγα; and it is probable that the scribe, misled by the γ of the preceding line, wrote the genitive for the nominative and then added the definite article.

13. v. note to l. 13 and cf. the translation of the Ἀργανονα Βεβηδάς by S. Euriniger in Oriens Christianus, 3rd Series, III (1930), p. 259, O Thron der Gottheit. έφοράς here means rather of the heavenly one than celestial, as some antecedent to δν must be understood.

14. I can make no sense either of the end of this line or of l. 19. The mark of abbreviation of the κ can be clearly seen, but otherwise the letter resembles an η as much as a κ and, if the abbreviation stroke were ignored, η' δ' would be the easiest reading. In l. 19 after παραλάβει comes a dot, which I have taken for an ε, followed by a curved stroke which might be a carelessly formed v. If some other explanation could be found for these letters, the closeness of ας to μαρία would suggest Σαμαρία.

15. It is possible that a reference was intended here (παραλαβόθα) to Mary Magdalene's visit to the tomb before that of the other disciples.

16. The allusion here is to the opening words of the Magnificat μεγαλύτερη ἡ γυνὴ μον τῶν γυνῶν; the scribe then started with the initial words of the εἰρήμενα, but did not continue with it. For this cf. the 'Praise of Mary', printed at the end of the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom (Brightman, of cit., p. 399): τὴν τιμωσέων τῶν κυριώτικα καὶ ὑδατούχων ἀναγεννήσεως τῶν σαρκῶν, τὴν ἀλαφόδεους Θεόν Λόγον γενοῦν, τὴν ὄς τε θεοτόκος σε μεγαλυτέρη. The refrain of the hymn in the papyrus—ἐν ἡμοῖς μεγαλύτεροι—is frequently found as the last line of heirmoi and tropes of the ninth ode (Höeg).

17. στερεωθῆσαι: for the contraction cf. Traube, of cit., p. 119; this particular form is not quoted, but στερεωθῆσαι is found in the Sinaiticus, as is also στερεωθῆσαι. There is a close parallel to this line in the Octoechos, p. 93 σε δόν τοι στερεωθῆσαι χρόνων ... μεγαλύτεροι. This line has only 9 syllables instead of the 10 demanded by the heirmoi and the corresponding lines in the other stanzas: perhaps στερεωθημένου should be read.

18. The metre demands that the τω(π) before νεκρωμεν be kept; but εκ νεκρωμεν is the regular expression which must be read in l. 10 (cf. the metrical transcription), short of eliding the τ of ἀπαρχῆς.

19. Perhaps a reference was intended here to John ii, 19–20.

20. I am indebted to Dr. Zuntz for pointing out to me that the reference here must be to St. Theodore of Amasea (variously known as Tyro or Stratelates), who was martyred under Diocletian and was later very popular with the monophysites of Egypt, cf. an article, 'Der Drachenkampf des heiligen Theodor', by W. Henkstenberg in Oriens Christianus, ii, pp. 244 sqq.

21. A reminiscence of Ἰ Cor. xv. 20 μου δὲ Χριστός εὐγερτάται ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀπαρχῆς τῶν κεκοιμημένων. Γεγενημένου is clearly a corruption derived from κεκοιμημένων.
LITURGICAL FRAGMENT.

Acquired in 1917. 15 x 17 cm. Sixth century.

This text, written in a fine sloping uncial of the sixth century, consists of two columns, the first incomplete, on a sheet of parchment. Not much can be missing—at most five lines at the beginning and, allowing for a small margin, not more than two at the bottom of col. i. It seems to be more in the nature of a chant than a prayer, though there is no metrical element present. The stops, accents, &c., are in the first hand; there are the usual theological contractions. Over some vowels a single dot has been written; the purpose both of them and of the marks over \( \dot{\text{a}} \) (l. 8) and \( \dot{\text{e}} \) (l. 11)—too small to be accents by the standard of that over \( \dot{\text{o}} \)—is obscure. Below col. ii a few letters written by a second hand in very faded ink can be traced. The text itself is written in a clear brown ink on the hair-side. The verso is blank. Provenance unknown.

Col. i.

Col. ii.

\[ \ldots \text{συναχθη} \]
\[ \text{ταλμε οι πιστου} \]
\[ \text{ιν δεξιαλωμενος} \]
\[ \text{της αγιας τριαδος} \]
\[ \text{ει μων θεοτητι} \]
\[ \text{και ανυμη[σατε]} \]
\[ \text{τον παρ} \]
\[ \text{kai \ aei pαρθενο[ν]} \]
\[ \text{Μαριας' και χαρι[ν]} \]
\[ \text{10 τον ουρανων και} \]
\[ \text{ελεησουν ημας' κ[α]} \]
\[ \text{τα το μεγα σου \ en[ε]} \]
\[ \text{ος } \text{ι. ναι κυριε' } \]
\[ \text{... ... ... ...} \]

3. 1. δεξιαλωμενος. 5. 1. με[ς].

II. 1-13. 'O come together, all ye faithful (that he may be) glorified in the one godhead of the Holy Trinity and sing hymns unto him that is (? Saviour of all men, (? son of God) and of Mary ever virgin: and unto the heavenly choir. And have pity on us according to thy great mercy, yea (do so), O Lord.'

1. For the opening cf. the first line of the 'Prayer of Romanus' (quoted by Maas in Byzantinische Zeitschrift, 17, p. 310): \( \Delta \delta \epsilon \tau \delta \eta \pi ον \pi ιτολ \pi \rho οικουσιοσς \eta οριον. \Delta \delta \epsilon θί might perhaps be supplied in l. 1 here.

3. At most there is room for two letters: only if the line projects is there space for [\( \text{ων } \) \( \eta \)].

9. \( \chiρ[on] \) with \( \omegaριον \) in apposition can be read as the object of \( \alphaυμη\[κατε] \) if the reconstruction followed in the translation be adopted: otherwise we might read \( \chiρ[ον] \) \( \tauον \omegaριον \) (l. τον \( \omegaριον \) \( \eta \) \( ηπατων) \) and regard both that and \( \text{Μαριας as dependent on a verb such as δεσμεω.} \)

11-13. Cf. Psalm l. 3 \( \epsilonλεησου \) \( \mu e \), \( \delta \) \( \theta ι \delta \), κατ\( \alpha \) \( τo \) \( \mu ε \) \( σ\delta \) \( \epsilonλεν \) \( σον \).

13. \( \text{ναι, \( \kappaυριε.} \) These words, somewhat strangely employed here to complete the chant (if chant it is), occur three times in St. John's Gospel, in each case as a protestation, e.g. xxxl. 15 (Peter replies to Jesus' question) \( \text{Nai, Κυριε' εν σοι διας } \) \( \delta \) \( ηι \( \phiιλω \) \( σε \). Here \( \epsilonλεησου \) may be understood.
468. LITURGICAL FRAGMENT.

Acquired in 1917. 7 x 8 cm. Sixth century.

A fragment of a Coptic MS., probably already torn and discarded before being re-used, with Greek texts in different hands on either side. The Greek runs at right angles to the Coptic and across what was the upper margin of the page; hence it is unlikely that the whole MS., of which this was a page, was rewritten. The hand on the recto (the hair side) is of the bold but regular slanting type usual in this period; that on the verso is cruder and in paler ink. Both texts are clearly religious in character and probably liturgical, though they may have been meant for private use; I have not traced any quotation from Old or New Testament. Punctuation in both texts is by a middle point, followed by a small gap.

(a) Recto.

1. φο κ(υριο)ς ανεστ[...]. εκ
2. νεκρων [ν και(α)] τον θανατ[ου] το κρα.
3. τος [κατηγορησαντα ο].
4. ἡ σεβησ[η]τες οι λαοι μεταν
5. ἵλν επὶ το μνήμην
6. ρον πανενδοξον:
7. δρομον τον καλον;
8. [κεμνον.] και(α) τον ιδω
10. [ν βασιλειαν και δει
11. κα [.....]μαν
12. ἐπὶ [ης.

1. ξ P. 2. ζ P and in 8. 7. καλο Π.

2. The η might be the final letter of νεκρων, but it seems likely that the line was a little longer than this.
3. 1. κατηγορησαντα.
4. There is no sign of abbreviation above this line and the reading is plain (μν could be read for π). Was π(μν)υ(ν(αu)]τες intended?
5. 1. πη(ς) or perhaps τ(οι)θ = τίς.
6. The metaphorical use of δρομος is not uncommon in the Bible, but I have not found it coupled anywhere with καλον.

(b) Verso.

1. [.
2. ] τον [...]. [.]. θισν σου
3. [καθησι[,.] βασιλε
4. [. ο . α . πη[,.]μος . αγι

5. [.
469. EPISTLE AGAINST THE MANICHEES.

Acquired in 1920.  
Frag. (a) 35.7 x 19.5 cm.  
Late third century.  
PLATE 2.

This remarkable text, an elaborate and reasoned attack on the religion of Mani, might be classed either as a document or as a work of literature; in this respect it presents a parallel to St. Paul’s letters and (to adopt Dr. Deissmann’s distinction) should perhaps be designated an epistle. Herein lies, in fact, its interest; we find here information of a kind which we should otherwise get only through a literary source, in the shape of an actual letter. That it was in fact sent and intended for a definite recipient or recipients, there need, I think, be no doubt; the papyrus (which is of double thickness) has been folded, regularly, nine times, and though no part of the address survives, its natural place would have been on the back of the beginning, not the end of the text. Further the hand, though regular and of an official type, is certainly no book-hand, and the orthography (e.g. παλαιοι in 1. 12, οικονομαι in 1. 40) is characteristic of documents of the period. But as evidence of its semi-literary character we should note that the text has been read over by a corrector (see 1. 16), that punctuation is regularly found, and that in some cases the rough breathing has been added. But, formal considerations apart, it is obvious that the letter is not an ephemeral composition, as the carefully planned quotations from the N.T. show, but an authoritative, and in a sense, an official document; there is nothing personal either in the body of the document or in the final greeting, and in one place the writer uses the first person plural (l. 35). The style is in part modelled on that of the Pauline letters (cf. the numerous quotations from them), but—as far as we can judge from our text—shows no sign of having been written to a particular person, though no doubt written for a particular occasion, or even to a particular community. The theory that, to my mind, agrees best with the evidence is that this was a general epistle, drawn up in the chancery of the bishop of Alexandria, and circulated by him to the churches in his diocese.

It does not, however, I think, belong to a class of documents two specimens of which are already known to us from the papyri—namely the Festal Letter (επιστολας εορταστικας) that is the Festal Letter (επιστολας εορταστικας)

---

1 I am much indebted to Prof. A. D. Nock and Mr. C. R. C. Allberry for their advice and assistance, particularly for references to the literature of the subject, and to Mr. T. C. Skeat who read over the text with me in its early stages.

2 BKT. VI, pp. 87 sq. (P. Berol. 10677), ed. Schubart-Schmidt, with a valuable discussion of the subject, between A.D. 690 and 730; and P. Grenf. CXII, A.D. 577 or 672 (the editors of P. Berol. 10677 prefer the later date).
or γράμματα παραδίδως. The nominal intention of these letters was to announce the date of Easter (we know from Eusebius, H. E. v. 25, that the Alexandrian and Palestinian churches kept the feast on the same day and exchanged γράμματα relating to it), but at a comparatively early date this letter developed a special type of its own, and was used as an occasion for a homily on some point of morals or theology. Eusebius (H. E. vii. 20) attributes the origin of this practice to Dionysius of Alexandria (A.D. 247-265), a collection of whose festal letters was read by Eusebius as a source for his own history. At first sight the theory of a Festal Letter might seem to suit the requirements of our text; these letters were often devoted to pressing church problems of the day, and were meant for circulation in Egypt (the notice of the date still went to other churches, but without the appended homily). The objection to this theory—and it seems to me final—is that the Festal Letters always concluded with communicating the date of Easter, and of this there is no trace in our papyrus. A departure from the norm in such a case is hardly likely, and we must conclude that this letter was sent out on some other occasion.

The text unfortunately gives no hint as to what this occasion was, nor of the general date. The verso is blank, and our sole evidence is the handwriting. This is of a well-known type, regular and official in style, though not as stereotyped as chancery hands, and common near the end of the third century; to this period (approximately A.D. 275-300) I would assign the text. A date in the early fourth century cannot be excluded, but the hand seems to me less formal and more free than fourth-century hands. It bears an obvious resemblance even to a text as early as P. Flor. 254 (A.D. 259), and I should prefer, with due reservations, to assign it to the reign of Diocletian. In looking for an author for our epistle we might reasonably think of one of the bishops between the death of Dionysius (A.D. 265) and the succession of Athanasius¹ to the see of Alexandria in A.D. 326. The bishops of Alexandria in this period were Maximus (265-282), Theonas (282-300), Peter (300-311), and Alexander (311-326). If it be granted then that the letter was written in the later part of the third century and originated in the episcopal chancery, we might assign it to the episcopate of Theonas. One other consideration gives a slight support to this dating. In A.D. 296 (for the date see the references in E. Stein, Geschichte des Spät-römischen Reiches, p. 121) Diocletian, in reply to a letter of Julianus, proconsul of Africa, ordered a general persecution of the Manichees; the sect was to be ruthlessly suppressed and its leaders, with their books, to be burnt.² Diocletian's persecution was inspired by political and social considerations, particularly by fear (it seems) of Persian influence, and his edict evinces no knowledge of the sect's tenets or practices; but his attitude to these exsecrandae consuetudines and abominandae scripturae might well have been endorsed by the author of 469. We may reflect that at the time when this edict was promulgated, the Church was at peace with the Empire (a letter from Theonas to Lucian, a Cubicularius, on the duties of a court official is extant), and if Church and State, each from its own point of

¹ If, palaeographical grounds apart, the letter were as late as the time of Athanasius and were written by him, we should expect to find some traces of it in his works.
² Text in Haenel, Corpus Juris Romani Anti-Justiniani, ii, p. 44. The genuineness of this 'edict' has been doubted, but it is accepted not only by Stein and Seeck, but also by P. Alfaric, Les Ecritures Manichéennes (Paris, 1918), p. 61. The fact that it shows no detailed knowledge of Manichaeism should count rather in its favour (given the early date) than against it. Whether it actually was an edict or not is irrelevant for this discussion; the important fact is that governmental action was taken at this time in the neighbouring province of Africa.
view, had recently recognized the danger with which the religion of Mani threatened them, we might well expect them to take simultaneous action. Diocletian’s edict was addressed to the proconsuls of Africa; but we may be sure that there were Manichaean communities in Egypt before there were any in Africa. The recent discoveries of the Manichaean Coptic papyri at Medinet-Madi in the Fayum have shown us how well established the sect was in middle Egypt in the fourth century, nor is it any longer surprising that one of their earliest opponents should come from Lycopolis. There is, then, nothing improbable in the suggestion that Manichaeism constituted a sufficient danger at the end of the third century in Egypt to merit an attack such as we find in this letter, and in that case the Church may well have made an informal alliance with the State in the prosecution of this campaign; indeed, the requirements of loyalty alone (since Christians were then loyal to the Government) might have secured the opposition of the Church to the new sect. Unfortunately there is no evidence as to the provenance of our text; it is worth recalling that some fragments of Manichaean literature in Syriac, dated not later than the fifth century, have been found at Oxyrhynchus, but if, as there is good reason for thinking, the sect was spread widely throughout Egypt, the existence of a Manichaean community at Oxyrhynchus is not a convincing reason for assigning our papyrus to that site.

Mani died, a prisoner of Bahram I, king of Persia, in A.D. 276; our text is probably the earliest anti-Manichaean document we possess, and evidence of the rapid spread of the new religion (or sect, as perhaps it should be called). The works of other early opponents of Manichaeism—of Serapion of Thmuis, of Alexander of Lycopolis, of Titus of Bostra—and, to a less extent, the Acta Archeleai, show more interest in the cosmogony and theology of the Manichee than in its practical effects and moral consequences. I cannot find that these writers have been influenced by our text; but that is hardly surprising, for if we are right in thinking this letter is a pastoral charge, questions of morals or practice would naturally take precedence over theological arguments. (It is quite possible that, at the date when this letter was written, very little was known of Mani’s system.) The document which in general tone it resembles most (for verbal resemblances see the notes) is another disciplinary document of the Church—that is, the Formula of Abjuration, which converted Manichees had to recite before being admitted to the Byzantine

---

1 Cf. C. Schmidt and H. J. Polotsky, Ein Manicha-Fund in Aegypten (S. B. Preuss. Akad., 1933, pp. 4-90). The authors discuss the history of Manichaeism in Egypt in the light of the new evidence: it appears that Lycopolis (Assiut) was probably the propaganda centre for Egypt of the sect. It seems first to have taken root in the town of Hypsele in the Thebais.


3 This is the date given by W. Henning in Ztschr. der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, 90 (1936), p. 6; for an earlier view see H. H. Schaeder, Ueber Formen und Fortbildungen des Manichäischen Systems, p. 71.

4 Schaeder (op. cit., p. 72 sq.) thinks he wrote c. A.D. 300: but it rests on a general statement—οἱ πᾶσιν μὴ ἔχοντας ἐκ τῶν κοσμίων—(Schaefer),—which hardly constitutes ‘sichere Zeichen’ (Schaefer).

5 It might be thought to have some affinities with the work of Serapion of Thmuis, an Egyptian bishop, who was in close contact with Alexandria: but as R. P. Casey’s recent Study of his Adversus Manichaeos shows (Harvard Theological Studies XV, 1931), Serapion differs from the writer of our epistle in style, vocabulary, kind of attack, and knowledge of Manichaean writers (he does not quote a single Manichaean work); nor are his Biblical quotations the same.
469. EPISODE AGAINST THE MANICHEES

Church (Migne, P. G. i, 1461–71). In its present form this document is thought to be not earlier than the sixth century,¹ but in substance it is probably much earlier.

When our text begins in l. 12 (l. 1–11 are too fragmentary to yield any connected sense) the writer is engaged in refuting, by appeal to the Bible, the teaching of the Manichees on marriage; arguing, apparently, that the Manichees do not distinguish between the divine blessing on marriage and the divine condemnation of fornication and adultery, he cleverly turns the tables on his opponents by reasoning (with the support of Jeremiah iii. 9) that the terms ‘fornicators and adulterers’ include those who ‘worship the creation’. Thus the Manichaean attitude to the material world is condemned as a form of idolatry, and as convincing evidence of the ‘madness’ of the sect (see note on 1. 18) he quotes the ἄπολογος πρὸς τὸν ἄρτον (see note on l. 25). This apparently concludes his attack on the specific teaching of the Manichees; but the writer takes the opportunity of warning his readers against the false doctrines and moral depravity of the Manichaean missionaries, particularly of the θέλεικτα. In the best style of early theological controversy he alludes to their alleged προκαταλήψεις and then passes on to another subject. The epistle ends with an elaborate benediction and farewell consisting of a cento of Pauline phrases ingeniously strung together.

Biblical phrases are preceded by no introductory formula (except perhaps in l. 47) nor are quotation marks inserted in the margin. No doubt a considerable part of the epistle is lost in which the writer may have dealt with theological questions; we must allow for at least one column before col. i, though perhaps not for more, for if the roll were much more than double its present length it would hardly have been folded (there are nine folds in the existing fragment) but sent as a roll. It is unlikely that more than a few lines are missing between col. i and col. ii at the top of the latter; the break in the argument is not considerable, and the papyrus is unlikely to have been very much higher than it is now. Fragment (b) I have been unable to place; in all probability it belongs to col. i, but it does not appear to touch fragment (a) at any point, nor can I fit it in with the initial lines of col. i. Its subject is clearly the divine judgement upon sinners; it may have belonged to the introductory part of the epistle.

The first hand appears to be responsible for the lines of contraction, punctuation, &c., though a corrector inserted the καταλήψεις of l. 16. The papyrus is light in colour and of good quality; the ink black, or rather grey, as it has been heavily mixed with water. At the foot of col. ii, near the edge (the last line of col. ii corresponds with 1. 20 of col. i), a different hand has written in very pale ink and thin characters ἀγωνιείς (see note to l. 40). Otherwise the bottom of this column and the margin is blank.

---

¹ v. P. Alfaric, cf. cit., p. 120.
ΤΗΛΟΓΙΚΑ ΤΕΧΝΗΣ (ΑΥΓΕΙ)

5 το εσθ οτε

[προθέτει]

10 προθετέει

[ησαν] αυτοί παλείν οι Μανίχες κατα

[ψηφίζεται τον γαμον ὡς ο μη] γαμον καλος ποιει τον μη γαμον

[τα πρεσευ τοις Ηαυλος λεγει οτι δε ο μοιχεων και δ πορ

15 κακος διηλον εκ των θειων γραφον αφωι μανθανων

[οι τυμως ο γαμος πορτονυς δε και μοιχους μεισι ο θεος διηλο

[εστιν αυτον κατακρινει] και τους ηθους σεβαζομενους

[οιτερ . . . έμπανουσαρ το ξυ[λ]] ναι και του λι[θ] ον ου μην

[άλλα κολάζει τον τουφέτα το ποιηρο προτασεσει ουτως

20 εαν δε ευρεθη ανηρ η γυνη εν μια των πολεων σου ον κυριος ο θεος

[διδωσι σου οι θεος και νους] το ποιηρον ει]νατι κυριου τον θεου σου προ

σκυνων τω

[ηλιω η παρτι των εκ του κοσμου β] δελυγμα εστιν κυριου τον θεου [σ] θο

πας ποιων

[ταυτα βδελυγμα εστιν κυριου τω θεου] και οι Μανίχες δηλωντι προσθυ

[νουι την κτισιν] ει ταυς επαιδειας βδελυγμα εστιν κυριου

Col. ii.

25 [. . . . ουδε] εις κλεισαρου εβαλον αλλ] οι ηπιοις ταυτα εγιο

αγαθιως εφαγον οθεν εκοτες εστιν γρωναι στο πολης μαν]

ας πεπληροντοι οι Μανίχες και μαλιστα ηπι η προς τον αρτον

αυτων απολογα εργον εστιν εκθροπου πολης μανιας πεπληρω

μουν ταυτα εις προειπον εν συντομω παρεδειην απο

30 του παρεβλητους εγγραφου της μανιας των Μανίχεων]

ιν επιτηρομεν τους εις απαταις και λογος ψηφιζει εισδυνω

τας εις τας οικιας και μαλιστα τας λεγομενας παρ αυτοις εκεκλατε

ας ει την εχουμεν δια το δηλωνοι χρηζειν αυτους του απο

της αφεδρον αιματος αυτων εις τα της μανιας αυτων μυστα

35 χρατοι αμ μη θεους μολυνουν ου ζητουντες το εαυτων

συμφορον αλλα των πολιων εις σωθεσιν παρασχο

τογγραφον δι παναγαος και ταγγαγος θεους ημων απο ταυτο

ειδον επειρουν απεχομενον ημων σωζεσαι ημων ολοκλη

ρον και το πνευμα και την ψυχην και το σομα αρεμπτος

40 ει τη παρουσια του κυριου ημων Ιουστου Χριστου αποστασαθαι αλλη-

λους
EPistle AGAINST THE MANICHEES

Again the Manichees speak falsely against marriage saying that he does well who does not marry. Paul says that the man who does not marry does better; but that the adulterer and fornicator are evil is manifest from the Holy Scriptures, from which we learn that marriage is honoured by God, but that He abominates fornicators and adulterers. Whereby it is manifest that He condemns them also that worship the creation who... have committed adultery with stones. Not but what God commandeth us to chastise the man that doeth evil: in these words "If there be found man or woman one of the cities which the Lord thy God giveth thee that has wrought wickedness in the sight of the Lord thy God and hath worshipped the sun or any of the host of heaven, it is an abomination unto the Lord thy God. Everyone that doeth these things is an abomination unto the Lord thy God. And the Manichees manifestly worship the creation (and that which they say) in their psalms is an abomination to the Lord... (saying) "Neither have I cast it (sc. the bread) into the oven: another hath brought me this and I have eaten it without guilt". Whence we can easily conclude that the Manicheans are filled with much madness; especially since this "Apology to the Bread" is the work of a man filled with much madness. As I said before, I have cited this in brief from the document of the madness of the Manicheans that fell into my hands, that we may he on our guard against these who with deceitful and lying words steal into our houses, and particularly against those women whom they call Helect and whom they hold in honour, manifestly because they require their menstrual blood for the abominations of their madness. We speak what we would not, seeking not our own profit, but the profit of many that they may be saved. May therefore our God, the all good and the all holy, grant that ye may abstain from all appearance of evil and that your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ. Greet one another with a holy kiss. The brethren with me greet you. I pray that you may be well in the Lord, beloved, cleansing yourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit!"
THEOLOGICAL TEXTS (GREEK)

14. Cf. 1 Cor. vii. 1 sqq. For κριέσαν cf. v. 9 κρίετον γάρ ἐστιν γαμέων ἡ πυρόβολοι.

15. A stronger word than κακός seems to be demanded by the tone of the passage: κατάρατος, otherwise suitable, would make the line rather long.

16. Cf. Hebrews xiii. 4 τιμάω δὲ γάμον εἰς πάντας, καὶ ἡ κοιτὶς ἀλλήλων ἄφορος ἐκεῖνος γὰρ καὶ μοιχαίς κρυπτὰ Ὀθέος. δὲ οὐδὲν αὐτὸν after ἀφόρος has some MSS. authority and the sentence is frequently quoted (e.g. by Clement and Eusebius) in this form; it is probably found here because it suits the writer's argument better than γάρ. For the variant μοιχὲς there is no authority. The use of this verse in the present context may perhaps support the view that it is a declaration (i.e. supply ὡς) rather than a precept.

17. Cf. Rom. i. 25 σύνεις μετὰλλαζον τῷ ἀλλήθειαν ταῦτα ὸθὲν ἐν τῷ ἔρθειν, καὶ ἐσεβέσθησαν καὶ ἐλατρευνον τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τῶν κτίσων.

18. The quotation is from Jer. iii. 9 (cf. ii. 27). In their own place the words refer to the worship of idols; the writer of this epistle ingeniously employs them to bridge the transition between his attack on Manichaean views on marriage and that on their attitude to the material universe. This attitude was determined by the Manichaean belief that among the elements of Darkness which largely compose the world, particles of the Divine Substance, i.e. the Light, are intermingled: consequently the devout Manichee, although holding that the world, on the whole, was evil, had to guard against injuring any of the particles of the Light; hence his respect not only for all living creatures but for vegetable life also (see F. C. Burkitt, The Religion of the Manichees (Cambridge, 1934), pp. 16 sqq., and note to ii. 25 sq.). In its extreme form this involved the view that whoever ate bread, himself became bread, and whoever killed a mouse, became himself a mouse.

19. It is the name for this formula (Acta Archelai, ed. C. H. Beeson, p. 16). Cf. also the passage from Albirunt, Chronology, p. 190, 15, quoted by Holl in his note to Epiphanius, Panarion 66, 65, 14 sq.: He absolutely forbade his followers... to hurt the fire, water, and plants, and Faustus (as quoted by Augustine, Contra Faustum, xx. 2): quaeque et nobis circa universa et ovis simuliter erga panem et calicem par religio est.\(^1\)

There is a passage in the Formula of Abjuration which converted Manichees had to recite before entering, or re-entering, the Church closely parallel to the present text (printed among the opera dubia of Clement of Rome, Migne, P. G. 1. 1463): ἀναθηματίζει τοὺς τὸν Χρίστον λέγοντας ἑαυτὸν τὸν ἤλιον καὶ εὐχόμενον τῷ ἥλιῳ, ἡ τῇ σέληνῃ, ὁ τὸς ἀτρόμος, καὶ ὅλως αὐτοῖς ἐς θεοῖς πρόσχοινται καὶ φανοντός θεοῖς ἀποκαλύπτεται.

20 sq. These lines are a free adaptation of Deut. xvii. 2–3 ἐὰν δὲ εὑρήθῃ ἐν μιᾷ τῶν πώλων σου, διὸ κέρπος ὁ Θεοῖς σου ἑδωκὼ σου, ἀνήρ ἡ γυνὴ δὲ τοῖς τοῦ θυσιασμοῦ ἐναρτων κυρίῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ σου, παρέδεχον τῇ διάθεσιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλάττωσεν λατρεύων θεοῖς τῆς τρόπως καὶ προσκυνήσων αὐτοῖς, τῷ ἥλιῳ τῇ σέληνῃ τῇ πάντα τῶν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τοῦ θεοῦ... The reconstruction here is, of course, doubtful, but there is no room for ἁγία ἡ γυνὴ in l. 21.


23. Although the general sense of this passage is plain, no supplement consistent with the length of the line has suggested itself to me; οἱ πάντες γὰρ (or οἱ ἱδών) would be too long. έπιστολά: most probably a reference to the Manichaean hymns (among the Manichaean papyri recently found in Egypt is a book of Psalms, see Schmidt–Polotsky, op. cit. pp. 31 sq.), although the writer may well have had in mind the ἐπιστολά ἐπιστολή of Deut. xvii. 11, cf. Migne, P. G. 1. 1468 ἀναθεματίζει καὶ κατανεμαίτο πάντας τοὺς Μανιστοὺς, καὶ πάνας αὐτὸν βίβλα καὶ πάνας νήπιον, μᾶλλον ἐν γονέας.

25 sq. At this point the author of this epistle quotes in an abbreviated form (v. 1. 29) the formula recited by the Manichaean elect before they ate the bread provided for them by the Hearers and which they regarded as sacramental (Burkitt, p. 83). This was already known to us from the third century Acta Archelai, both in the Latin translation (Hegemonius, Acta Archelais, ed. C. H. Beeson, Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, Bd. 16, Leipzig 1906, p. 16) and from the Greek of Epiphanius, Panarion, 66, (ed. K. Holl, Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller, Bd. 37, Leipzig 1931, 65, 4 sq.:) the relevant passage in the Greek reads as follows: καὶ τῶν μελλόνων ὑδάτες ἄργων, προσεῖναι πρὸς τῶν ἄργων, οὕτω εἰς ἡμᾶς ἡμᾶς οὕτω ἡμᾶς, οὕτω εἰς ἡμᾶς ἡμᾶς, οὕτων ἐκλήσαις ἡμᾶς· ἀλλὰ ἄλλος ἐτοίμης ταῦτα καὶ ὢργηγεῖ μοι· τῷ ἀνάπτυκται ἔργῳ. The name for this formula Ξηρινών προς τῶν ἄργων appears to be new. The reason for this ἐξόδως was of course the belief that sowing and reaping and even the breaking of bread involved, no less than the taking of life, injury to the particles of the Light imprisoned in matter (Burkitt,

\(^1\) Cf. also the letter ad Iustitiam Monachum I ascribed to Marius Victorinus (Migne, P. L. 3, 999): caraque haec nostra quam additis solum hortis et graminibus quae diligentibus, et again, quod cornem oris et gramina venerantis.
This practice (cf. the passages quoted from Cyril of Jerusalem and Titus of Bostra by Holl, op. cit., p. 65) involved curing those who had been responsible for the making and baking of the bread: εἶνα ἰδεῖσμα ἐς χείρα τῶν ἄρτων (οὐ οἰ εἰ τοῦτο μετανοοῦντες ἐξομολογήσατο), ἐγὼ σε οὐκ ἐπιθύμησα, φησίν ὁ Μανικαῖος τῷ ἄρτῳ καὶ κατάφας τέμπει ἐν τῶν ἄρτων καὶ καταράτω τῶν πτερυγίων καὶ οὐθέν ἐσθίει... ἐγὼ σε πολὺ οὐκ ἐπιθύμησα: ἄπειρα ἀπήριστα σε (Cyril of Jerusalem, vi. 32). Cf. also the Formula of Abjuration, Migne, P. G. 1, 1465 ἀναθέματι τοῖς βρωμάσις ἀπέχεισι προστάτισται ἡ θεόν ἡκτορν οἰς μεταληφήν.

26. μανία: the pun on the name of Mani was too obvious to be avoided, but μανία is in any case the regular term for 'heresy', see Sophocles, Lexicon, s.v.: cf. Serapion of Thmuis, Adversus Manichaeos (Migne P. G. 40, 903) τοῦ Μανικαίου προβάλτω μανία.

30. Unfortunately there is nothing to show from what Manichean treatise the writer was quoting: it must have been an early one, possibly a work of Mani himself, and perhaps contained besides the formula here quoted, no doubt accompanied with regulations for the life of the devout Manichee, the ἐπανάδεξιν mentioned in l. 24.

Liddell and Scott cite no instance of ἐγγραφαῖ = document, treatise in the singular; but ἐγγραφαῖ is quoted from OGL. 335. 137.

37. Cf. Alexander of Lycopolis (Teubner ed.) 8, 14 ὡς χαλαγαὶ... μετατητήσεως γάρ τινα ἀπάντησιν ἔστιν τῶν λόγων. The Manichaean 'elect' included women as well as men, also known as the παρθένοι (cf. Burkitt, op. cit., pp. 45, 46, and, for a further note on the organization of their eremitic societies, Journal of Theological Studies, xxxix (1934), p. 350). It is perhaps worth noting that ἐκλεκτός occurs in the New Testament in 1 John 1 and 13 ἀπετέλεσεν σε τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἄληθος σωτήρια σου τῆς ἐκλεκτῆς, cf. also an inscription published by F. Cumont, Recherches sur le Manichéisme, iii, p. 177 Βάπτισα παρθένου Λυσία Μανικαῖα. They were also named in the Formula of Abjuration (Migne, P. G. 1, 1468) ἐκάκασις, πρεσβυθερίας, ἐκλεκτοῦ καὶ ἐκλεκτᾶς.

In view of what follows in our text it is worth while noting the testimonial to the morals of the Manichaean 'elect' given by St. Augustine (Burkitt, p. 46, note 2) who, since he had had personal experience of their practices, was probably better informed than the writer of this letter; another comparatively early writer, St. Ephraim, accuses them of nothing more than idleness (Burkitt, p. 43).

34-5. τοῦ τῆς αἵματος αἰματος. For the ritual and magical use of menstrual blood cf. H. J. Rose's note on Martial, Epigr. iv. 64, 16 in Classical Review, xxxviii (1924), p. 64. For its use in magic and charms see P. Oslo i, 323 with Eitrem's note ad loc. From the connexion with magic probably came the (alleged) use of it attributed to some heretical sects. This may be compared with the magical powers attributed to virginity (see E. Fehrle, Die Kultische Keuschheit im Altertum (Giessen, 1910), passim, and A. D. Nock in Archiv für Religionswissenschaft 23 (1925), pp. 25 sq.). There appears to be no other evidence attributing such practices (doubtless without foundation) to the Manichæans. The source of the attribution of this practice to the Manichaæans may perhaps be found in Migne, P. G. 1, 1465 ἀναθέματι τοῦ τοῦ ἀληθοῦς οἴρος ἐκτὸς ἐπιθυμεῖται, καὶ μὴ ἀνεχόμενος τὸν ἡμῶν ἀνθρώπον ἄφαντα ἐσπάνειον, τὸ μὲν μιμοῦσα, φασὶ, τὸ ἄφετον. Failure to comply with (or rather a deliberate denial of) the regulations of Deut. xv. may have given handle to the kind of attack we find here.

A similar practice is attributed to a Gnostic sect in Pistis Sophia 147 (389) (see C. Schmidt's introduction to his translation, p. lxxii), from which the author of that work vehemently disassociates himself. Probably Epiphanius (Pan. 26, p. 284) is referring to the same sect.

34. μνευματα: Liddell and Scott quote only one instance of this noun, from Aeschylus, Supplícites 595. μνεύμα, however, = μνήματα, is cited from Aquila's version of 1 Kings (xxiv. 26), and μνήμαται (though not found in Sophocles' Lexicon) is used by Christian writers, e.g. John of Damascus, Passion of St. Artemius (Migne, P. G. 96, 1392 B) τοῦτο... τὰ ἐπισυνεργήματα μνευμάτων οἱ δὲ θεοὶ, and in the Formula of Abjuration, op. cit. 1, 1469 ἀναθεματιζομένως τοῖς ἐπισυνεργάσιμοι... μνευματοφόρως τὸ ἑαυτόν.

35. ὑ τὸ ζητοῦμεν κτλ.: adapted from 1 Cor. x. 33 μη ζητήσει τὸ ἐμαντοῦσα σώματος, κτλ. It may be noticed that the papyrus reads σώματος (with N&ABC), not σώματος (N&D), the more common word.

36. παρασκεύα: παρασκεύα = to allow to, with the infinitive, occurs, though rarely, in Classical Greek; the nearest parallel to the present ('grant that') appears to be a Christian letter of the fourth century, P. Oxy. 1083, 6 ἦ οἷον τῷ Θεῷ πρὸς τὸν Τιττὸν παρασκεύα τὸ μετὰ ὀλυμπιάς σε τῷ ὀλίγῳ ἀπολλαξω (quoted by Moulton and Milligan, Vocabulary of the Greek N.T., s.v.). There is no instance of its use with the infinitive in the N.T.

37. τοιούτων: In Classical Greek generally stands first in the sentence (the only exceptions given by
J. D. Denniston, *Greek Particles*, are in Hippocrates and Lucian), as always in the N.T.; Moulton and Milligan give examples of its use in the second place from the papyri.

The scribe began to draw a line over παντός, on the analogy of the nomina sacra.

38. ὀλίγημα κτλ. = 1 Thess. v. 23, with σώζομαι inserted at the beginning instead of προθεσία at the end, and with τὴν ψυχήν for ἡ ψυχή: also in 1 Thess. v. 23 ἤσώ comes immediately after ὀλίγημα. F. E. Brightman (Journal of Theological Studies, ii, p. 273) points out that this trichotomy (instead of the dichotomy found elsewhere in the Pauline letters) has its parallel in Egyptian rites, where the order, however, is always ψυχή ἄμα, πνεύμα.

40. Cf. 2 Cor. xiii. 12, 13 ἀπόσασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν ἀγίῳ φίληματι (= Rom. xvi. 16) ἀπόσασθαι ἐκατ' οἱ ἀγιοὶ πάντες. The αγιοι added in a second hand at the foot of this column may be a reference to this passage.

41. Cf. Tit. iii. 15 ἀπόσασθαι σε οἱ μετ' ἐμοῦ πάντες; but the phrase is so common that we need not suppose the writer of this letter had any one passage in mind.

43. Cf. 2 Cor. vii. 1 καθαρέωμεν ταυτώς διό παντὸς μολοσφόρον παρόκες καὶ πνεύματες. καθαρέωμεν is not found in the N.T.

45. Perhaps a quotation from Ps. xxxvi. 34.

470. CHRISTIAN PRAYER.

Aquired in 1917. 18 x 9·4 cm. ? Fourth century.

This prayer, written in brown ink on a small sheet of papyrus (the verso is blank), is probably a private copy; there are no indications that it was intended for liturgical use. The hand, tall, upright, and pointed, with small blobs at the top and bottom of vertical strokes, is of a peculiar type to which I know no exact parallel. The α is of a kind more common in inscriptions than in papyri, and Dr. Bell suggests that the peculiarity of the script might be explained on the ground that it was a model for an engraver.

Mr. Lobel has pointed out to me that the hand resembles somewhat that of the letter of Subatianus Aquila (Schubart, *Papyri Graecae Berolinenses*, 35; cf. id. Palaeographie, p. 73) with its large and narrow characters; the α, ε, and to a less extent the ι, are similar in both texts, but the peculiar Ν found in 470 is missing in the other, which on the whole is less decorative. Lobel would be unwilling to place 470 later than the third century. But such individual hands are hard to date, and it is almost incredible that a prayer addressed directly to the Virgin in these terms could be written in the third century. The Virgin was spoken of as θεοτόκος by Athanasius; but there is no evidence even for private prayer addressed to her (cf. Greg. Naz. Orat. xxiv. 11) before the latter part of the fourth century, and I find it difficult to think that our text was written earlier than that (cf. art. 'Mary' in Hastings, Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics).

. το  .
ευσπλαγχνε ναρθενε?
κατ αφέσιν αμαρτιων?
470. CHRISTIAN PRAYER

θεοτοκε: τα[ε εμας?]  
5 ἱκεσιας: μὴ παρ-  
 eius ἐπὶ περιστασεὶ  
αλλ ἐκ κινδύνου  
ρυσαν ἡμας”  
μονή δι[
]  
10 ἐπιλογ[ 

5. 1. παράγραφ. 6. 1. τν.

4–9. 'Mother of God (hear) my supplications: suffer us not (to be) in adversity, but deliver us from danger. Thou alone . . .'

1–3. Dr. G. Zuntz, to whom I owe the supplement in 1. 2, suggested that το[θ(ς δο] might be read here; but the traces do not resemble an η; in 1. 2, less probably, some form of πλάνη might be recognized. καὶ for κατ cannot be read.

6. περιστασι: not Biblical in this sense, but common in later Greek, v. Sophocles’ Lexicon, s.v.

7. Cf. the liturgical fragment from Dēs-Belyzeh, printed by Wessely in Les Plus Anciens Monuments du Christianisme ii, Patrologia Orientalis xviii, p. 444, I recto, ll. 11–12:

ἀλλα[δ βίοι ήμις δ]  
pο παντὸς κινδύνου.

471. CHRISTIAN AMULET.

Acquired in 1920. 14.3 x 8.6 cm.  
Fifth century.

It is fairly clear that this brief prayer, written across the fibres of a small piece of papyrus in a large cursive hand, was used as an amulet; the papyrus was twice folded so that it could easily be worn or carried on the person, and although it differs from most amulets in being less specific and personal (for a discussion of the types of amulets, cf. Wessely, Patrologia Orientalis, xviii, pp. 399 sqq.), the language leaves little doubt of the purpose for which it was intended.

+ Ἀγιον ελεον αγαλλιάζως  
kata ταυτης αντικειμενης  
energias kai pros eγκεντρισμον  
της καλλιεργεου σου καθολικης(κ)  
5 κα(ι) ἀποστολικης(κ) εκκλησιας(κ) εφε  
amen +

1. 1. ἐλασον. 3. 1. ἐνεργεια. 4. 1. καλλιεργεων.

'The holy oil of gladness against every adverse Power and for the grafting of Thy good olive tree of the catholic and apostolic Church. . . . Amen.'


2. αντικειμενη ενεργεια. Cf. the phrase in the Sacramentary of Serapion of Thmuis (F. E. Brightman in J.T.S. 1, p. 264, l. 28), ενεργειαν λαται της προσβαλλοντος αυτοις αντικειμενος ενεργειας.
3-4. A reminiscence of Romans xi. 17-24, cf. especially 24 el yap ev ek tis kata phasw eksekathae agionlaioun kal para phasw eksektrothetai elis kallielaious. The prayer is, then, one for the extension of the Church by the grafting of the Gentiles (agionlaios) onto the good olive tree (kallielaios) of the Church. kallielaios. The word first occurs in literature in the passage of the Romans cited above: but kallielaios, kallai, is found in P. Cairo Zen. 125. 3, kallielaios, and in a collection of Jewish-Christian sayings of the third or fourth century published by O. Plasberg (Strassburger Anekdoten, A.P.F., ii, p. 219), who discusses the use of kallielaios by the Fathers.

5. I can find no explanation of the letters at the end of this line: the only one about which there can be any doubt is the φ (and that is a very likely reading): if ε be read it is difficult to interpret the preceding stroke. ευται = ευται is barely possible.
II. LATIN TEXTS

472. LATIN LITURGICAL FRAGMENT:

Acquired in 1917. 15.6 x 18.7 cm. Third to fourth century.

This text, written on both sides of a leaf—the final leaf—from a papyrus codex, presents peculiar difficulties. It is unique of its kind, for among the numerous Christian papyri from Egypt only three Latin fragments are known, all of them biblical, all of them considerably later than our text; and the majority of the Greek liturgical papyri belong to a much later age. Further, outside the world of the papyri there are hardly any Latin liturgical texts with which 472 can be compared and from which it can be elucidated; apart from the Latin text of the so-called Egyptian Church Order (ed. E. Hauler, Didascaliae Apostolorum Fragmenta) our knowledge of the wording of the Latin liturgy before the sixth century is slight. The difficulty is enhanced by the forced and abrupt style and somewhat exotic vocabulary in which the text is written; the first twenty-two lines appear to consist, for the most part, of nouns and adjectives almost unrelated by verbs, and the writer passes from subject to subject with great rapidity. It would be easier if we could assume that much of the text was missing at the beginning of each line; but not only are the last three lines of the verso practically complete as they stand, but to assume that the lines were longer would involve the breadth of the book being greater than the height, and among the numerous fragments of codices recovered from Egypt there is no certain example of this. As it is, the codex was nearly square; a page, with the lines restored on the analogy of II. 20-22, and allowing for an inner margin equal in width to the outer, would have measured c. 18 cm. in breadth, while in height the papyrus measures 18.7 cm. In view of the absence of parallels and of the inherent difficulty of the text, all supplements, except the most obvious, have been reserved for the notes.

That the text is Christian may be regarded as certain, and that it is part of a liturgical codex there can be little doubt. Both form and content make against the view that it is a private composition; such texts (to judge from the Greek examples from Egypt) are generally crude both in script and orthography, and on single sheets of parchment or papyrus,
while not only is the general appearance of 472 that of a well written manuscript, but the subscriptio on the recto makes it clear that it is a leaf from a codex. The language, also, suggests a public rather than a private occasion. But to assign it to a definite place in the liturgy is not so easy; nor is this in itself surprising. For example, P. Lond. Christ. 4, of the fourth or fifth century, is related only very slightly to extant liturgies; and, more important, it is known that at this period liturgical prayers did not follow fixed forms, and African bishops may well have enjoyed some degree of freedom in the composition of their masses. That the text formed a part of the Eucharistic Anaphora is improbable, although the use of manducare in l. 3, which has eucharistic associations, and the concluding part of the text with the prayer for the breaking of bonds (?) and for illumination, resembling that found in the eucharistic prayer of the Egyptian Church Order, might favour this hypothesis. But the text as a whole supports Dom Wilmart’s view that it contained formulae for the blessing of the new fruits (or possibly exorcisms for the same occasion), followed by a prayer for those who offered or received the fruits. (The concluding prayer, however, seems to be more general: see note to l. 33.) He would compare it with the prayer, probably of the early third century, for the same occasion preserved in The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus (Hauler, p. 115), which is perhaps worth quoting in full:

 Gratias tibi agimus, Deus, et offerimus tibi primitias fructuum, quos dedisti nobis ad percipiendum, per verbum tuum enutriens ea, jubens terrae omnes fructus adferre ad laetiam et nutrimentum hominum et omnibus animalibus. Super his omnibus quibus nos juvasti, adornans nobis omnum creaturas variis fructibus per puerum tuum Jesum Christum dominum nostrum, per quem tibi gloria in saecula saeculorum. Amen.

This is far simpler both in thought and expression, and lacks the theological overtones of our text; but that the prayers should be much elaborated is, so Dom Wilmart writes, precisely the foreseen case for the third or early fourth century. One other short passage—a prayer at the offering of cheese and olives—is worth quoting as it approximates more nearly to the style of our text (Hauler, op. cit., p. 108):

Fac a tua dulcitudine non recedere fructum etiam hunc olivae qui est exemplum tuae pignudinis, quam de ligno fudisti in vitam eis qui sperant in te. It is perhaps best to conclude that some such prayer as that quoted above formed the basis of our text, but that it has been elaborated in a manner and for a purpose which it is not easy to understand. The one clear allusion in the papyrus, that to the Saeculum Octavum which we know as a periphrasis for the millennium (see note to l. 29), is not very illuminating, since the fact that the same idea is found in St. Augustine is hardly sufficient to indicate an African origin for our text.

One of the peculiarities of the text is that there appears to be no quotation nor even any certain recollection of any biblical passage. That the language should not resemble that of the Vulgate is not perhaps surprising, since 472 is probably considerably earlier; but I have been able to find few, if any, convincing parallels to the vocabulary of our text in the

\footnote{On local diversities of liturgical use, cf. L. Duchesne, Christian Worship (trans. McClure), pp. 54 and 85.}

\footnote{Connolly, op. cit., p. 107, note 1, who quotes from Hauler, op. cit., pp. 106-7: ut mortem solvatas et vincula diaboli dirumpat et infernus calcet et justus illuminitum, with which ll. 25-6 and 35-6 should be compared.}

\footnote{Mr. Ratcliff points out that the dies fabant of l. 11 might be an allusion to the Christian Sunday; this, if correct, taken with the offering of the fruits, would suggest that 472 was a prayer to be said on Sunday.}

\footnote{See note to l. 28.}
works of early Christian Latin writers. But it may be regarded as fairly certain that our

text is not an original Latin work; there are several indications that it is based on a Greek

original—the use of puer to translate παῖς, where we should expect to find filius, the spelling

evanagelium (though this might mean no more than that the scribe was more accustomed
to Greek), perhaps, too, the use of hilara imago, and above all the expression pater nostri.

A search in the Monumenta Ecclesiae Liturgica has not revealed a single other instance of

this expression and, as it occurs twice, in l. 7 and l. 22, it can hardly be a scribal error;

the only explanation open to us seems to be that it is a literal translation of πατήρ ἡμῶν.

Perhaps those whose knowledge of Greek Christian literature is better than the writer’s

will be able to throw some light on the source of this text.

The date assigned to this papyrus rests solely on palaeographical evidence. The text

is written in a careful and regular hand, which, though it contains a large proportion of
cursive and ‘mixed’ letters, is clearly in its general effect a literary and not a documentary

hand. With seven letters (a, e, f, p, t, u, and x) the uncial form is used, c and q are of the
mixed type, and the rest are cursive, although side by side with the cursive forms of h (h)
and n (n) the capital forms (H) and (N) are also found. (Both forms of n can be seen in
l. 3 in the plate.) o is of the very small cursive type, and the g resembles the Greek
numeral Ϝ. In this text the formation of the later uncial hand can be observed. The closest
parallel to this hand, both in general appearance and in the forms of some of the letters,
is the Oxyrhynchus Epitome of Livy, and to this text an approximate terminus ante quem
can be assigned. On the verso of the Livy Epitome is written the Epistle to the Hebrews
(P. Oxy. 657), in a hand which the editors say may well go back to the first quarter of the
fourth century: not only were the documents found with this papyrus of the third century,
but so were also the cursive documents with which the verso was patched before it was used
for the Epistle to the Hebrews. There is, then, a very strong presumption that the Livy
Epitome was written near the end of the third century. Although the Livy Epitome has
only five cursive forms as against ten in 472 (in itself by no means an indication of late
date), the general resemblance is such as to allow us to assume that the two MSS. are not
separated by any long period. Consequently, a date in the later third or early fourth

century is indicated for our text. The orthography on the whole is good, though an
unnecessary i has been added to magnificenter in l. 22, and the difficulty of the language tempts
one to assume occasional scribal errors (see note to l. 14); as is normal, b often usurps the
place of v. The only case of ligature is ii in l. 2 and l. 40. There are no contractions or
abbreviations except -ē at the end of l. 2 (see note), and punctuation is only found once in
l. 6; elsewhere a short space is left at the end of the sentence. As the leaf is the final one
of the codex, we might hope to find the title of the work; but the space below explicitus
has been left blank; numeration also is absent. Unfortunately there is no evidence as to
the provenance of the papyrus.

Verso.

[............]entia nostra dulcissi
[ma .........]rabilis gloria fruges vivē

1 P. Oxy. 668 = Milne, P. Lit. Lond. 120: plate and description now in E. A. Lowe, Codices Latin Antiquiores, ii. no. 208.

2 The Livy Epitome must therefore have been written not later than the fourth century, and it more probably belongs to the
third (P. Oxy. 668, introd.): see also P. Oxy. 1379, introd.
[tes . . . . .]e manducantes qui g[e]ne
[. . . . . . .]es prudentiae victus
5 [ . . . . . . .]pios hilara imago [c[e]
[. . . . . . .]em frementum. [i[v[ens
[. . . . . . .]rietate pater n[o]stri
[. . . . . . .]qui vincendum propri
[. . . . . . .]em imago missio [p]rinci
10 [ . . . . . . .] qui sui facies sancti [. .]. ul[i]s
[ . . . . . . .]anotuor dies faboris [o][l]a[io
[. . . . . . .]tiu aquarum haustu[. .]. cen,[]
[ . . . . . . .]aggelium vitae spes et [. .].lesir
[ . . . . . . .]uus sancta virginis pater [. . .]
15 [ . . . . . . .] aspectus et auditus et pedibu[s]
inibus pace dextra tu es intus
[ . . . . .]a nostri tu sanctum caelum
[ . . . . . . .]uper noba terra et nostrorum
[ . . . . . . .]um aspector et designatio ben[c
20 [dic][i]onis trabea nobis mittitur
me[e]o[iae adh[ec] cui[m]num tua doni
[ne] magnific'entia tua pater nostri lux

Recto.

alma qui gubernas a[
han[eg]otiationem h[
25 liberas huius humana[
lorum dissolutione o[
tio luci]s recta vi sanc[tj[
ascensu occasionique ad[
strum seculum o[e]ctayum
30 dominus qui inter nos e[
bor puer designatus le . h[.]
[. .][a][. ] impotentum qui vi.[x]
[ . . . . . . ] morbos animarum . [ 
[ . . . . . . ] qui[i] in oblione sunt e[su[
35 et] mentibus nostris clari . o . { 
ras formas nostras caligin[e ] et jas[i]
ritas . . [ 
[.kas nos[. .] . .
ere >t—

explicitus >—

1. Perhaps oboedi[entia.
2. mi]rabilis, or admira[bilis, is perhaps the most likely supplement. At the end of the line nivæ =
472. LATIN LITURGICAL FRAGMENT

nive(m) might be read, but though the abbreviation stroke in Latin would generally indicate -m, rather than -en, the latter is so commonly abbreviated in Greek papyri that nive(m) [esse is probably to be preferred. v is also palaeographically preferable to n and yields a better sense. Visvnes, which was used of the olive and the vine (see Lewis and Short, A Latin Dictionary, s.v.), might well be used of fruges.

3. Perhaps last. Manduce, a word rare in classical Latin, is frequently used of the Eucharist by Christian writers, e.g., Hauler, op. cit., p. 207; Passio S. Perpetuae, 4 in Texts and Studies, i, 2, p. 68, l. 8 (early third century). The word, however, is by no means confined to this use; cf. Didascalia (Hauler, p. 79, 2) tanguam nolentus manuducare et bibere, and Philaster (ed. F. Marx, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, vol. xxxviii, 112. 8 bona terres manducabillis, which suggests that terreus might be supplied here: cf. below, l. 18.

4. Here the sense may be we who partake of the sustenance (provided by) Thy wisdom.

5. It is difficult not to suspect that the text is corrupt here. The reading, apart from the o (in place of which u might be read), is quite certain. The only Latin nouns ending in -fus given by Gradenwitz in his Latercali Latinus are rufius and coléfus, neither of which need be considered, and there is no adjective ending in -fus; nor is -phus a more helpful termination.

hilara imago suggests St. Paul’s use of évagán, e.g. 1 Cor. xl. 7 (άπρόφ) évagán όλον βοσκε θεος úrφóρναι, and 2 Cor. iv. 4 (Xiphotos) δι κτών évagán ρολή θεοτ, and in Latin, cf. Philaster, 137, 4, imago divina et patris proprius, while hilara may have been prompted by the bósca of 2 Cor. iv. 4. But imago need not be used in its Christological sense, cf. the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus (Hauler, op. cit., p. 119, 7) (Christus) faciens imaginem resurrectionis.

6. It is tempting to emend to frumentum, as Wilmart suggests; the reading is certain. After this word is the only stop that appears in the papyrus; elsewhere pauses in the sense are indicated by spacing.

7. The first seven letters of this line are unlike any others in the text; they are faded and appear to be written in a reddish brown ink, whereas the rest of the text is written in black ink. This suggested that the letters were part of a rubric, but no suitable phrase is at hand and on the whole it seems more probable either that the scribe, by mistake, used a different ink or that his pen had run dry and the colour is the result of his scratching on the papyrus with insufficient ink. As a supplement vives in sua propriritate might be hazarded; if the writer is still referring to the fruges, valpriritate would be more appropriate.

There is a distinct space before the invocation pater nostrá (for the peculiar form see the introduction).

8. vincendum: the second u has been written over an m. A possible supplement for this and the next line would be vincendum proprium filio (or puero) hostem (or Satalgam); but it is difficult to see where the verb can have stood. Vincendum proprium inimici. Thou hast taken unto thyself the conquering of the enemy, would be difficult, if not impossible, Latin. For proprius used much as filio is in the N.T., cf. Hauler, op. cit., p. 101. quanta quidem Deis secondum propriam voluntatem praestitit hominibus.

9. principalis is used of the Holy Spirit in the prayer at the consecration of a bishop in the Latin version of the Egyptian Church Order (Hauler, op. cit., p. 105) nunc effundens eam virtutem, quae a te est, principalis Spiritus, quam dedisti dilecto filio tuo. The presence of the word missio immediately preceding principe here is in favour of a similar use of the word here; but it would be difficult to read spiritus into the traces surviving at the beginning of the next line. It may, of course, have been contracted; but the papyrus shows no other examples of contractions of nomina sacra. Alternatively, the word may be part of an invocation: cf. principium principis in Commodianus, ii, 49.

10. I have not placed sultus—Wilmart’s suggestion for the word at the end of this line—in the text, because, although sull could easily be read, it does not seem possible that both a t and a w intervene between the f and the s, even allowing for some cramping of the letters (not apparent elsewhere) at the end of the line.

11. I have been unable to make any sense of the letters preceding dies at the beginning of this line, although most of them are clear enough. Instead of f, u (or o) might be read, and in the space between it and the following n there might be room for an i (e.g. noli). The letter preceding the r (which I originally read as si—a possible but less likely reading) is blotted, and the scribe’s intention may have been to expunge it, but anolus is not more promising. It is hard to avoid the conclusion that the passage is corrupt. Ratcliff points out that dies favoris might be interpreted either as (1) the eighth age (see note to secundum octavum, l. 24), or (2) the day of triumph of the good, cf. Malachi iv. 1, or (3) the Christian Sunday. Perhaps the last is the most likely.
After oblatio there is room for two more letters; but there are no traces of ink, and the surface of the papyrus does not appear to be rubbed. The scribe, however, does not observe a straight margin; victus in l. 4 is similarly set back in the line. There can be little doubt that oblatio is to be construed with the subsequent words.

12. Perhaps [visen]tium aquarum, though there is room for a longer word. After haussu there is room for m or for two other letters, e.g. in con[a] might be read. For the sentiment cf. Philaster, 20. i (dominum) ... fontem aquae vivae.

13. The Graecized spelling of evangellium is worth notice. The sentence may be compared with P. Lond. Christ. 4, 12-13 σοι ἐκ τῶν θεωρῶν λόγον ἡγοικός {τω}ν δόχεων. At the end of the line is- is as likely as is-.

14. Either nos or nus could be read. It is difficult not to believe that an ‘e’ has fallen out here and that we should read sancta(virginis).

15. This line is reminiscent of 1 John i. 1 6 ἐν ἀγίῳ δόχεω, δ ἀνθρώπων, δ ἡμῶν το ὅσιος ἠμῶν, but it is not easy to fit pedibus into any sentence based on this. If the sense is trodden under foot, i.e. rejected of all men (and the expression, though strong, would not be impossible in the exaggerated style of this text), pedibus sputus omnium may have been the reading of the papyrus; if the line was as long as l. 2, there would be room for two more letters after pedibus.

16. The pause after -nitus indicates that a new sentence begins here; but although this section of the text is better preserved than the rest, it is no less baffling. The surface of the papyrus on the inner edge of the margin has flaked, and consequently it is possible, though not likely, that space for a couple of letters should be allowed for at the end of this and the next two lines. Pace dextra tu es intus is difficult to construe, even if dextra be taken as an adjective. Parte was certainly not written. Possibly the sentence ran tu es intus [in anima] nostri (cf. the use of pater nostri). The s above the x of dextra has been added by the first hand.

18. noba (l. nova) terra may be an ablative governed by super; otherwise nova terra(e) in the sense of ‘first-fruits’ would agree well with the first part of the text.

19. The word aspector is so rare (the Thesaurus can only quote a single instance, from S. Augustine, Serm. 117, 12 existit imago max ut aspector extelleri; the reference is to a mirror) that it seems better to assume a slip on the part of the scribe and read aspectaret. On the other hand, the presence of a noun here would make the construction of the sentence, with nostrorum and the subsequent word dependent on it, easier.

20. trabea is a difficult but, it seems, an inevitable reading; the r is mutilated, but could only be replaced by f or s, neither of which would be possible in this position. Trabea is used several times in a metaphysical sense by Christian writers on the Incarnation; Forcellini quotes from Fulgentius, Sermo de S. Stephano, heri rex nostor trabea carnis indutus (see also Ducange, Glossaria mediae et infimae Latinitatis). Ratcliff suggests a parallel with the ‘robe of the soul’ in the Syriac Hymn of the Soul (ed. A. A. Bevan, Texts and Studies, v. 3; see e.g. pp. 13-9, 39, 1-146, 25, 72, etc.)

A space of some three letters has been left after multisur at the end of the line.

21. m(i)nimen, i.e. munimen—an easy enough error for a scribe whose Latin was scanty. Between the m and the n there is only a very little space—probably enough for an o. Consequently, the reading munimenta (which would also have left an unexplained letter before domit) is best abandoned. The sentence would run: Place it in thy memory; our defence is in thy magnificence, O Lord, in thy kindly light, O Father of us. Lux may be a reminiscence of the ψωτ θεοῦ of Isaiah xliv. 6.

22. Read magnificentia.

24. negotiationen: a word used in the Vulgate, though only in its literal sense of business, trafficking. Wilkam suggests that here it might be the equivalent of χερσοθεία; Ratcliff suggests εορμαγοίς or πραιμαγεῖς = plan, disposition, comparing 3 Kings x. 23 ἄνω τῇ πραιμαγεῖᾳ τῆς προφητείας (ac. of Solomon), or else work, as in id. xi. 1. Possibly it might refer to the whole process of the offering and consecration of the fruits. It is worth noting that in Goetz-Gunderman, Corpus Glossarum Latinarum, negotiatio is twice (li. 133, 18, and 414. 61) glossed by πραιμαγεῖα; the use of the latter in the N.T. suggests that negotiatio here might mean secular life, the affairs of this world.

25. Wilkam suggests for this and the next line liberas huius human[e creaturar]um dissoludine—which would fit exactly the estimated gap, though a direct object to liberas is still wanting. We may compare the Egyptian Church Order (Hauler, op. cit., p. 105) extendit manus cum pateretur ut a passione
liberaret eos qui in te crediderunt; cf. also the passage from the consecration prayer in the Canons of Hippolytus (Monumenta Ecclesiae Liturgica, i. p. 264 (no. 2562) et tribue illi facultatem ad dissoluenda omnia vincula iniquitatis daemonum, et ad sanandos morbas (cf. morbos animarum in l. 33 below).

Another possibility would be to read [saeculorum dissolutione] which might look forward to the saeculum octavum of l. 29.

27. Wilmart suggests sanctificas: Thou sanctifiest with the direct force of Thy light.

28. Perhaps a reminiscence of Malachi iv. 2 but unto you that fear my name shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings.

29. A letter may have intervened between the $u$ and the m of -strum; more probably it is a case of irregular spacing.

In saeculum octavum is to be found perhaps the only certain allusion in the papyrus. In The Book of the Secrets of Enoch (ed. R. H. Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, ii, pp. 425 sq.) the view is stated that, as the world was created in six days, so world history is to endure for six days, or periods, each of 1,000 years; then follows the Sabbath, the seventh day or period of rest, in its turn succeeded by the eighth day, when time ends and there shall be 'neither years nor months nor days nor hours' (op. cit., p. 437).

This particular millennial system does not seem to have been widely adopted and references to the eighth day are scarce. In the De Civitate Dei xxii. 30, § 5, we read have tamen septima erit Sabbatum nostrum (the seventh day could be identified with the earthly rule of the Messiah), eius finis non est vespera, sed dominicus dies velat octavus aeternus. There can be little doubt that the saeculum octavum of the papyrus is the dies octavum of Augustine: it is strange that there is no trace of the words, and little of the idea, in the preceding centuries. In the Oracula Sibyllina (ed. Geffcken) ii. 311 and vii. 140 there is a reference to the coming of the Millennium in the eighth adae; see the editor's note on the latter passage which suggests that there may be some connexion between this idea and the Gnostic Arxhýgýros Óψýbas. From a different point of view a passage in Philaster (141, 2 sq.), in which octavus is used metaphorically in connexion with oblation, is of interest.

The writer is advocating the symbolic interpretation of the Jewish festivals: octavaque est plenitudinis fructuum plenitudoque vindemiae Octobris mensis omnium postrema colatio et consummatio, and again (ibid. 3): octiens enim offerentes dona annua et octave dies qui ipsa dominicae plenitudinem cognoescentes divinique spiritus actintis fortitudine id est summum verum perfectionem praedicit, queque hoc extensus saeculo, resurrectiones ille promissam gloriam se posse consequi cælestis dignitatis consortio copulati desperarent, quod dominus dignatus est dicere tunc eritis sicut angeli iustis omnibus et perfectis hoc praedicemus quod et Deus dixit pro octava adventibus. With this should be compared a passage in the Didascalia (Hauler, p. 75: see also R. H. Connolly's edition (Didascalia Apostolorum, Oxford 1949), pp. 235-7, with his note); the author, arguing that the Christian Sunday is prior to the Jewish Sabbath and that it is both the first and the last day (supra sabbatum) of an eight-day period, writes sed et ipsa sabbatus intras se eum resurrectionem, sabbatum ad sabbatum sunt octo dies; octava igitur, quae super sabbatum est, unam sabbati.

31. Puer designatus. The use of puer here instead of filius is due to Greek influence, as pāre is commonly used (though not by St. Paul) of the Son of God, e.g. Acts iii. 13 δ Θεου... ἐδόθαι τῶν παύη ὄρθω ίηρου, and, outside the N.T., Didache ix 30 ἐγιαοράσα τίνω δι ίηρον τοῦ πάπη σου. Puer is rarely used in this sense in Latin; it occurs in the Vulgate version of Acts iv. 27—sanctum puerum tuum Jesum—and several times in the text of The Apostolic Tradition, e.g. (Hauler, p. 106) gratias tibi referimus per dilectum puerum tuum Jesum Christum and (p. 107) glorificamus te per puerum tuum Christum.

Designatus = ὁ υἱός τῆς εἰρήνης, τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς εἰρήνης. Designatur, however, is not used in the Vulgate version of the N.T. to translate these words; it occurs in Commodianus, Apol. 435 crederes quem libri designant.

At the end of the line perhaps two letters should be read between the $u$ and $h$: $l$ $g$ or $h$ $t$ $h$ ($l$ lethals) would be possible, but the traces immediately before the $h$ do not resemble an $e$.

33. The text seems to end with a prayer, first, for those sick in body or mind, then for the dead (qui in oblitione sunt) and finally for illumination and release from darkness (? for those making the offering). The prayer in the Epiclesis of Sacrament of Thamus may be compared: καὶ πάνω τῶν κυνωνίων φίλων ἐκεί δίδω καὶ ἑαυτῶν καὶ ἐς ἐνδοκιμασί ψάλη προσκοπή (text in

On the importance of the number eight in Babylonian astronomy and astrology (cf. the eight towers of the temple of Belus, Herodotus I, 181) see A. Jeremias, Handbuch der altorientalischer Geisteskultur (Leipzig, 1913), pp. 43, 107 sq., 130.
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Brightman, Journal of Theological Studies, i. (1899), p. 106). Cf. also the conclusion of P. Wurz. 3. verso, 13 sq. τούτο δὲ ἄρρητον(τοῖς) τοῦ λαοῦ συν θεραπευτῶν, [οῖς] ἀπενεδούσα λαοῦ (I. I 89) and (I. 18) ἐπὶ τῇ δρᾶσι καὶ ἐρωτησίᾳ, for which cf. also P. Lond. Christ. 4. 9-10.

36. Cf. Cyprian, Ep. 76. 7 ut de istis quoque tenebris et laqueis mundi nos quoque uobiscum integros Deus liberat.

39. Perhaps [miser]ere—unless the scribe kept to the Greek rule of dividing the word before the consonant.

40. Explicitus: it is interesting to find this written in full without suspension, as it has been held that the correct expansion of exp. is explicit, not explicitus (so apparently Steffens, Latinische Paläographie, no. 23). The correct explanation is given elsewhere and by W. M. Lindsay, Palaographia Latina, ii, p. 21, who mentions that explicitus is also found in the Leyden Priscian.

473. SALLUST, HISTORIES.

Acquired in 1917. Oxyrhynchus. 13.8 x 18.4 cm. Second to third century.

PlATE 3.

Shortly after I had been able to establish the identity of this papyrus, on the verso of which is the Greek astrological treatise, 527, by the coincidence of l. 18 with Hist. I, frag. 83 (ed. B. Maurenbrecher), it came to my notice that another fragment of the same roll existed among the unpublished papyri from Oxyrhynchus, in the possession of the Egypt Exploration Society. It was obviously desirable that the two texts should be published together; and since the Committee of the Society have generously given me permission to make use of their text, it has been printed below as (2). The two fragments do not join; but the similarity both in subject matter and script of both the Greek and the Latin texts leaves no doubt that they come from the same roll (or perhaps from different rolls of the same work written by the same scribe). The Latin text is a magnificent example of Rustic Capital writing, not unlike P. Ryl. 42, recently identified by Dr. E. A. Lowe as Sallust, Bellum Iugurthinum, 31. 7. It is, however, somewhat earlier than this, as the Greek text on the verso can be assigned to the third century and so sumptuous a manuscript is not likely to have been used very soon for a second text. The lay-out of the text was on a scale comparable to the script; the lower margin measures 7 cm. in depth, and a space of 4 cm. was left between the columns. The number of lines to a page cannot be exactly estimated, but it was probably not less than 20. There is no punctuation; but apices are found three times in (2), and a dash is occasionally used to mark the division of a word. The only example of ligature is -um in algosum (l. 8) and infidum (l. 35).

The position of (2) may be regarded as certain; its subject is clearly the ethnology and past history of Sardinia, of which it is known that Sallust treated at the beginning of Book II of the Histories. Further, it is highly probable that II. 42-3 contain an extant fragment (II. 7) dealing with the story of Daedalus's flight to Sardinia. The position

1 Unless otherwise stated, all references to the Histories are given from this edition.

2 Codices Latin Antiquiores, ii. no. 223 (with plate).

of (1), the Rylands fragment, is by no means so sure. It describes a successful attack
from the sea on a land force described as genus trepidissimum Graecorum et Afrorum
semermium, who have shortly before killed some allies of the attackers; the latter are
successful, and after burying their allies and plundering the neighbourhood, they proceed
on their way to Spain. So far the papyrus; and were this all, the whole incident might
be referred to the withdrawal from Sardinia of the defeated forces of Lepidus, under the
leadership of Perperna, to join Sertorius in Spain. But the lost line of this column of
the papyrus is supplemented by an extant fragment (1. 83) which adds to the words
perrexere in Hispaniam two more, an Sardiniam. Unless we are prepared to assume
either that the words perrexere in Hispaniam occurred twice in the same book of the
Histories, or that the text is corrupt—and neither alternative seems very probable—the
words cannot refer to Perperna’s withdrawal. 1 But in the first two books of the Histories
there are two other episodes to which this fragment might be attached. The first is the
flight of Lepidus from Italy after the failure of his coup d’état; to this incident fragment
I. 83 is referred by Maurenbrecher and Dietsch. 2 But our authorities mention no naval
battle; we are only told that Lepidus was utterly defeated by Pompey near Cosa in
Etruria and then fled to Sardinia. 3 There is, however, a statement in Exuperantius (3, 26)
which, because it does not refer to the battle at Cosa, is referred (Maurenbrecher, Proleg.
14, note 2) to the previous attempt of Lepidus in 78 B.C.: sed in Etruriae lite sore commisso
proelio coeperat Lepidus esse superior per armatam multitudinem quae odio rerum Sullanarum
se Lepidi partibus applicarat. If we may assume (and it is not a difficult assumption) that
this refers, not to an incident of 78 B.C., but to an engagement fought by Lepidus after his
defeat at Cosa, we may note that it meets some of our requirements. A battle has been
fought on the sea shore; Lepidus has had an advantage, but clearly does not sustain it
(i.e. is forced to sail away); further, his forces are described as armatam multitudinem,
perhaps in contrast with those of the enemy (cf. the armati and semermium of the papyrus).
It remains to identify the genus trepidissimum Graecorum et Afrorum semermium. It is
possible that this phrase might be used by an opponent (and Sallust’s sympathies might
well be with Lepidus and against the Senate) of the crews of a Roman fleet; at this time
the ships were manned partly by Greeks of the allied cities of South Italy and partly by
libertini, among whom might be men of Carthaginian or Phoenician descent. It is true
that there is no other evidence that a fleet was used against Lepidus (and on this interpre-
tation we should have to suppose that the crews of the ships were on the shore when
Lepidus attacked them), but a fleet had been sent under P. Servilius in the previous year
against the pirates, and there is nothing impossible in the use of a fleet on this occasion.
On this view (1) would probably belong to Histories I; but as one book of the Histories
may well have proved too extensive for a single roll, especially when written on this scale,

1 Other objections to this view then arise: (a) there is no record of any engagement fought by Perperna on this occasion;
(b) it is very doubtful whether the description genus trepidissimum Graecorum et Afrorum semermium could apply to the
inhabitants of Sardinia, however mixed their descent; (c) it seems likely that in the Greek text (2) precedes (1) and, as the Greek
is written the reversed way up, this involves that, in the Latin, (1) the description of the fight would precede (2) the
description of Sardinia.
2 Sallusti quaæ superunt, ii. p. 33.
3 On the authorities for these events, see Maurenbrecher, Prolegomena, pp. 14 sq., and his edition of the fragments of the
Histories, pp. 20 sq.
they may both have been part of the same roll. It must be admitted that this view involves a number of assumptions which have little evidence to support them.

The alternative theory, first suggested to me by Professor Last, would relate this fragment to the adventures of Sertorius in 81 B.C. Near the end of 83 B.C. Sertorius had left Rome to take up his position as governor of Hispania Citerior, and when in the next year the Sullan general, Gaius Annius, crossed the Pyrenees and advanced against him, Sertorius retired on Cartagena and thence with three thousand men took ship for Africa. He landed on the Mauretanian coast, but the natives (described by Plutarch as βάπτασματα) attacked his men as they were fetching water and inflicted heavy losses on him. He set sail for Spain again, but was driven off and, together with some Cilician pirates who attached themselves to him, attacked the island of Pituoussa (Iviza). Here he was defeated by Annius’s fleet, and after various adventures (irrelevant for our purposes) later in the same year landed again in Mauretania, this time to free the inhabitants from the rule of a certain Ascalis, who had been placed on the throne by Cilician pirates. He achieved his purpose and apparently spent some time in the country before accepting the invitation of the Lusitanian ambassadors to lead a rising in Spain.¹ Two considerations in favour of this theory should be noted; it has been established (see Maurenbrecher, Prolegomena, 27–9) that Sallust devoted a good deal of space to the career of Sertorius, whom he greatly admired, and that Plutarch drew extensively on the Histories for his Life of Sertorius. Unfortunately there are objections to associating our fragment with either of these two incidents. If it relates to Sertorius’s first visit to Mauretania, it is difficult to explain the words Graecorum et Afrorum semernium in this context, nor does Plutarch mention a counter-attack by Sertorius’s troops, nor would one expect to find socii used of his detachments. On the other hand the description quoted above might well be applied to the Cilician pirates with their native allies, who were Sertorius’s opponents on his second visit to Mauretania; but after the war was over Sertorius stayed some time in the country, and this will not suit the perrexere in Hispaniam of the papyrus. In spite of these difficulties it may well seem more probable that (1) relates somehow to Sertorius’s adventures than that it treats of the flight of Lepidus; in the absence of definite evidence it is best to leave the question open.

Sallust seems to have enjoyed a certain degree of popularity in Egypt; he is found more often in the papyri than any other Latin author, except Cicero and Virgil. In addition to P. Ryl. 42, another fragment of the Bellum Jugurthinum has been published by P. Lehmann in SB. Preuss. Akad. 1934, no. 4, and the Bellum Catilinae is represented by P. Oxy. VI. 884 and P. S. I. 1. 110. For valuable help in the preparation of this text I am indebted to Professor H. M. Last and Professor E. Fraenkel.

¹ Our chief authority for these episodes is Plutarch’s Life of Sertorius, cc. 6 sq.; see A. Schulten’s article on Sertorius in RE. 2. 1 (2 Reibe), 1746 sq.
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[. . . . .]. aàrąq [...]. [..]
[.].tusiretedolorisin
5 talibussociisamissisar
matinavibuseivolant
scaphisaautnançdopars
[ ].uppibusialitusaqlgosum
> [.].npulsisnequeeosdiuti
10 [.].hostesmanseregenus
[.].eplitissimumgraeco
[.].umetaforumsememmi
[.].mdeinsociisprofortu
[.].humatisetomnibus
15 [.].aæsuierantexpropin
[.].corrptisubinulla
[.].sesettaprandiincepti
[.].rexreinhispaniam
20 [.]

(2) P. Oxy. sine numero.

Frag. (a).

Col. i

[.].ett[.
[.].ṣus[.
[.].siph[.
[.].rd[.
25 [.].n[.

Frag. (b).

[. . . . .].aniolag[. . . . .]
[. . . . .].mincertumtr[.
[.].ṣiri[.].isantestimo-
[.].umadscitaagentisba
30 [.].çosiritransfugas
[.].llanteosaliinum[.
[.].parshisanósputant
[.].lornorunexercituge
[.].ingeniómobiliiaut
35 [.].xorummetsuinidum
[.].civestecultubarba
[.].locelibericoetla
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Col. ii.

40 vit[i]
dii
daet[i]
fector[i]

Frag. (c) + Frag. (d).

\[ \text{lonec} \quad \text{lque} \]

\[ \text{... per} \quad \text{... ijisse} \]

9. The first \( s \) of \( impulsis \) has been corrected from \( l \).

TRANSCRIPTION B.

(i) P. Ryl.

5 talibus sociis amissis. Arm\-mati navibus e(i)voltant
scaphis aut nando, pars
[p]uppibus in litus algosum
[i]n puls; neque eos diuti-
10 [u]s hostes manusre genus
[tr]epidissimum Graeco-
[r]um et Afrorum semermi-
[u]m. Dein sociis pro forti-
[n]a humatis et omnibus
75 [qu]ae usu erant ex propin-
[quo] correptis, ubi nulla
[spe]s esset patrandi incepti,
[pe]rrexere in Hispaniam

(2) P. Oxy. \textit{sine numero}.

Col. i.

Frag. (a).

\[ \text{. . . . . . . . . . . .} \]

\[ \text{c. 15 letters} \]
II. 4-18. ... filled with anger and grief at the loss of such allies. Armed men rush out of the ships, some in skiffs, some swimming; others drove the sterns of their ships on to the seaweed-choked shore. Nor did the enemy, a cowardly crowd of half-armed Greeks and Africans, withstand them any longer. They then buried their allies as best they could, and laying their hands on everything near by that was of service to them, when they saw there was no hope of carrying out their design, they set out, making for Spain or Sardinia ...' 

II. 28-37. '... it being uncertain whether (the name) is ... or evidence of their foreign origin. The Balari were runaways from the Carthaginian army—according to the Corsicans, they came from Pallantia, while some think them Numidians and others Spaniards—a race whom either their fickle temperament or fear of their allies rendered disloyal, recognized by their dress, their manners and their beards. In the Celtiberian war ...' 

II. 42-3. '... Daedalus fled from Sicily to escape the anger and power of Minos'.

Frag. (b).

... an Iolaus [ ... ] 
... incertum [ ... ]
... larir[ ... is an testimo-
... um adscita[ ... ]
... Corsi transfugas 
... Pallantia, alii Num-
... Hispa[ ... putant 
... oenorum exercit; ge-
... ingenio mobil aut
... ciorum metu infidum,
... veste cultu barba.

Frag. (c) + Frag. (d).
4. *refertus* (of the first *r* of which only the smallest traces remain) is not found elsewhere in Sallust, nor can I find an exact parallel to this expression in any other author; for its use with the genitive cf. Kühner-Stegmann, i, p. 441, and for the expression cf. e.g. *spei bonae pleni* in *Iug.* 113, 2 and *plenum irae* in Tacitus, *Ann.* ii. 10, 2. *Incertum* (in the sense in which it is used in Tacitus, *Ann.* ii. 75 ultionis incertae) cannot apparently be used with a pair of nouns = *hastating between*. The singular is difficult, but may have been preceded by *quique*, a word of which Sallust is very fond (see the index in Dietsch, *op. cit.*).

For Sallust's use of *in* see S. L. Fighiera, *La Lingua di Sallustio*, 161; I can find no exact parallel to this usage, but it approximates to *in quae* 'in the case of'.


For this use of *pars*, cf. *omnis . . . pars* in *Iug.* 97, 5.

8. *algos* is quoted only four times in the *Thesaurus Linguarum Latinae*—once from Pliny (*N. H.* 33, 95), once from Ausonius (396, 43 *algos legitur litore*), and twice in Sidonius (*Ep.* 2, 2, 16—*fonsibus algidis, litoribus algosis*—and 8, 9, 5 vers. 33). The fact that twice out of the four times it is used with *litus* suggests that the writers may have had this passage in mind. For Sallust's use of adjectives in *-osos*, see Fighiera, *op. cit.*, p. 48; he remarks that they always denote abundance or excess, and ascribes their presence in Sallust to the influence of the early annalists.

9. The mark after *[ingulis]* may have been inserted by the scribe as a note that correction was required.

10. The dictionaries cite neither comparative nor superlative for *trepidus*.

11. *semianimatus*: the word is not found elsewhere in Sallust. It is noteworthy that with the exception of *semianimatus* (*Iug.* 21, 2), no instance of an adjective compounded with *semi-* is found except in the *Histories* (see Fighiera, *op. cit.*, 52) where *semianimus, semiratus, and semiplectus* all occur.

13. The nearest parallel in Sallust to this use of *pro* is perhaps *Iug.* 50, 2 *deinde sese pro re atque loco*, *sicuti monte descendere, paulatim procedere*.


18. = *Hist.* i, frag. 85 (Servius ad Aen., i. 329) *perrexere in Hispanicum an Sardiniam*, which Servius quotes as an example of the use of *an* as a disjunctive conjunction; cf. Madvig on *Cic. De Fin.*, 2, 104: *Thesaurus*, ii. p. 6, 83 sq.

21 sq. That this fragment belongs to the left-hand top corner of the first column of fragment (b) is made more than probable by the Greek text on the verso. It is possible that its last line may overlap with the first line (l. 25) of fragment (c). If, however, (a) belongs to another column, no other part of which survives, the ph of l. 23 might be part of the name of L. Marcus Philippus one of Lepidus' most active opponents.

24. Probably *[Sa]rdi or [Sa]rdi[ni].*

26. I am indebted to Prof. Fraenkel for the reading *Tolao*. According to one story of the settlement of Sardinia, Tolus led thither from Thessiae the descendants of Hercules, who were then known as *Iolada* (Strabo, v. 223), *Iolaeon* (Diodorus, v. 15), or *Iolada* (so the MSS. Diodorus, iv. 30). They were identified with the Elymians (cf. *R. E.*, ix. 1, 1845: *ix.* 2, 1062); that they are mentioned immediately before the Balari may suggest that the occasion of their mention by Sallust was the joint revolt by the two tribes against Roman dominion in 175 B.C. (Livy, xii. 6 and 12). On the other hand, as Daedalus is mentioned below, in *l.* 42, it is more likely that this passage is concerned only with the anthropological and mythical history of the island.

27. The parenthetic use of *incertum* appears to be confined, in the works of Sallust, to the *Histories*, cf. *iv.* 53 *suspectasque futi, incertum vero an per neglegentiam, societatem praedarum cum latronibus composisse*; also *iii.* 73 and *iv.* 1.

28. Instead of [*]ṣaría, [*]ṣaría might be read, and *t* or *e* might take the place of the first *i*.

29. *Balares*: Sallust's account of the origin of this tribe agrees fairly closely with that given by Pausanias, x. 17, 5. According to the latter, they were fugitives from Libya or Spain who had deserted from the Carthaginian army in the first Punic war and settled in the Sardinian mountains; *Balari* was the name given to them by the Corsicans and was the Corsican word for fugitives.

31. *[P]a[λ]lantes* : to the left of the first *l* is an ink mark which could not be part of the letter *a*, though it might belong to an *e* or perhaps an *i*. Consequently, if *[P]a[λ]lantes* is read, the mark must be regarded as due to a blot by the scribe. Another possibility would be to suppose that by a slip parallel to that in l. 9 the scribe wrote *[A]t[λ]lanteos* for *Atlanteos*, referring to the tribes living in the neighbourhood of the Atlas
mountains, elsewhere referred to as *Atlantes*; this form of their name is used by Ammianus Marcellinus, xv. 3. 6. Pallantia, a city in Hispania Tarraconensis, was one of the towns of the Vaccaei (or according to Strabo, iii. 163, of the Arevaci) who were opponents of Rome in the Celtiberian war; but why they should be distinguished from other Spaniards is not clear, as there seems to be no other record of refugees from either Carthaginian or Roman domination escaping and settling in Sardinia.


33. The mention of the Carthaginians in this passage suggests that Hist. ii, frag. 114 et Poni ferunt adversus may belong to a subsequent column; Maurenbrecher notes that it might find a place either in the description of Sardinia or in the history of Nova Carthago.

36. [no set:] not entirely satisfactory, but no alternative suggests itself.

37. The reference to the Celtiberian war, in which Pallantia and its neighbourhood were involved, suggests that Pallantios may be the correct supplement in l. 31.


40. Both of these fragments retain part of the upper margin, so not improbably they come from the same column—perhaps from the top of col. ii of frag. (b); but this is quite uncertain.

474. LATIN JURISTIC FRAGMENTS.

Acquired in 1917. Frag. (a) 10.8 x 7 cm. Fourth century. Plate 3.

In the preparation of this and of the other legal texts in this volume (475, 476, and 479) I have been greatly assisted by Professor F. de Zulueta, whom I have consulted throughout, and who has worked over each of the texts in detail; both the introductions and the notes, in as far as any legal issues are concerned, owe very much to him. I wish also to thank Professor W. W. Buckland, who has been consulted by Professor de Zulueta, and to whom the identification of fragment (b) recto of the present text is due.

474 consists of two fragments of a papyrus codex, almost certainly not from the same leaf. The hand is a heavy and sloping mixed uncial, in general style not unlike that of the Vienna Formula Fabiana (Steffens, Lateinische Paläographie, 14), though larger and less elegant, and is assigned by Dr. E. A. Lowe to the fourth century; the ink is a dark brown, smudged in places. There are two glosses, one Greek, one Latin; both are perhaps by the same hand, but are certainly not due to the scribe of the main text, though probably contemporary with it. Abbreviations, which are frequent and sometimes obscure, are marked by a line drawn over the letter or letters and a middle point placed after them. Thanks to the identification of fragment (b) recto the length of a line of text can be estimated at about 8 cm.; the height of a page of text cannot be determined, but as the upper margin measures 5.4 cm. (the side margins appear to measure 3 cm. on the outside and 2 cm. on the inside, giving a page about 12 cm. in width), the height of the codex probably greatly exceeded its breadth. Another example of this format is 460; there are reasons for thinking (see Schubart, Das Buch*, pp. 131 sq. and 186) that this was one of the earlier types of codex, when the latter was generally adopted for literary texts.

Fragment (b) recto has been identified with Digest XII, i, i, i, which is from Ulpian, Ad Edictum XXVI; as far as l. 12 the two texts are in agreement, but in l. 13 there is a disagreement, perhaps due to corruption in 474; in l. 14 they coincide again. The
other fragments have not, as yet, been identified, and it is very doubtful whether they are extant. The codex may have been a collection of excerpts from Ulpian or from various jurists, but on the assumption that it was a copy of Ulpian’s commentary on the Edict, some guesses as to the subjects of fragment (b) verso and of fragment (a) can be made. The former clearly discusses what is covered by the term *pecunia*; this might well be in connexion with the Edict *Si certum petetur* (Lenel, *Edictum*, pp. 232 sq.). In view of the shortness of the lines there can have been no great distance between the recto and the verso of the text; but if we look at Lenel’s reconstruction of that part of Ulpian’s *Ad Edictum* to which the recto apparently belongs (*Palingenesia*, ii, Ulp. 755 sq.) we find nothing resembling the text given us here. But it must be remembered that not all of Ulpian’s Book XXVI survives, and that 474 may quite possibly have consisted of quotations from various jurists, as did the *Fragmenta Vaticana*. In fragment (a) two supplements suggest themselves for ll. 4 and 5, *constituta* and *instituta*. The former is in itself the more probable and, since it is not improbable that the two fragments come from neighbouring pages of the codex, it may be noted that the Edict *De pecunia constituta* was commented on by Ulpian in Book XXVII (see Lenel, *Palingenesia*, 785 sq.), but no passage has been found in which the word *constituta* is repeated in such close proximity. If *constituta* is accepted as the reading in these lines, the recto might be referred to the commentary on *debitam* of the Edict *Qui pecuniam debitam constituit* (Lenel, *Edictum*, p. 247). But Ulpian’s commentary on this point is preserved in *Digest* XIII, 5, 1, 5–8; 3, 5; 7; 11, though it may have been abbreviated. There are, however, other possibilities, e.g. that this fragment deals with *indebitum* (cf. Ulpian, *ad Edictum* XXVI in *Digest* XII, 6, 26, 3 = Frag. Vatic. 266 (Lenel, *Palingenesia*, 774)), in which case it is fairly certain that the fragment is not extant.

The chief interest of this discovery lies in the fact that it disproves the alleged interpolation of *Digest* XII, 1, 1, 1 (see F. Pringsheim in *Zeitschr. Sav. Stift.*, 50 (1930), 375, with further literature; Lenel, *Edictum*, p. 235). This is important, because the scholastic character of the opening excerpts of *Digest* titles is a commonly accepted ground of suspicion. It can, of course, be answered that the interpolation is simply pre-Justinian; but it should be remembered that 474 was probably written some two centuries before the *Digest*.

474 was purchased together with 475 and 479 in Luxor, which suggests that their provenance may have been the Thebaid.
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Frag. (b).

Recto.

pr(aetor) et [de comoda]
to et de [pignore edii]
xit nam cu[icumque]
rei ad[sentia[mur a]
lienam fide[m secu]
ti mox re[c]ept[uri qui]
a ex hoc (contra)cu [cred]
[e] dicimur [ . . . . . ]

Verso.

[ . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ]
[ . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ]
pr(aetor) et [de eommoda]
to et de [pignore edii]
xit nam cu[icumque]
rei ad[sentia[mur a]
lienam fide[m secu]
ti mox re[c]ept[uri qui]
a ex hoc (contra)cu [cred]
[e] dicimur [ . . . . . ]

1. Accipere: probably in the sense, to understand by, in which it is frequently used by Ulpian; see Vocabularium Jurisprudentiae Romanae, i. 94-7.

4. For the supplement in this and the next line see the introduction. The point after si is in the papyrus and was probably inserted to mark the numeral; this may well come from an illustration, cf. Ulpian in Digest XIII, 5, 11, 1; Paul 12, 13.

7. A dot of ink to the left of pr(aetor), where the margin is torn, may be the trace of a gloss.

10. pr(aetor) et [de comoda] must be a gloss on adsentiamur, but there is no warrant for this meaning in the lexica; in Cod. Just. 1, (42), 11, 3, 41 (6) pr(aetor) = convey, alienate; no other legal meaning is attributed to either word. The mark above the line is a reference mark to the gloss.

12. quia: max recepturi quid; Digest. The quid of the Digest is in fact not very opposite here, as in the examples quoted what is to be recovered is not 'anything' but the actual thing handed over. There is, however, no other object to recepturi to hand, and quia increases the difficulty of the sentence; it would be a likely scribal error for quid. If quia is kept, the sentence will require another verb or else credere dicimur (which clearly should be the main verb corresponding to adsentiamur) will have to become the verb of the subordinate clause and the sentence as given in the Digest will be incomplete. Most probably, then, quia is no more than a corruption of quid.

The symbol for contra, in the shape of a rather cursive s, is that already known from other texts, among them the sixth century Fragmentum de lure Fisci which was found with the Verona Gaius (see Studemund, Apographum Gaii Institutionum, p. 250, col. i, ll. 9 sq.).

14. Just above the r of dicimur are traces of what was probably a reference mark to a gloss.

15. ded.: perhaps to be expanded ded(it), (erunt), vel sim. Studemund (op. cit., p. 243) gives no example of this contraction; dedere is regularly contracted ded. If some part of dare is to be recognized here, the collocation with culpa, which is a practically certain supplement, suggests a context dealing with damnum K
iniuria (dolo vel culpa) datum: cf. Ulpian in Digest XII, 1, 9, 1, which, however, is held to be certainly interpolated. But the reference may be to iniurandum, the field of which is very uncertain (see Buckland, Textbook of Roman Law, p. 633, note 8).

The marginal gloss against these lines may have been on synallagma, the Greek common word from early times for agreement and later used as the translation of contractus (it occurs twice in the Digest, II, 14, 7, 2 and L, 16, 19); assuming that it was written in Latin, we could read in ll. 1-2 [. . .]u[nal]a[g]ma v[er]b[um]. Only the bottom part of the g is visible, so that, if a mark of abbreviation was placed after or above it, it could not be seen. Unfortunately in l. 3 of the gloss gener(ale) cannot be read for cener, but a scribal error is not impossible. In Digest XII, 1, 1, 1 we have both generalis appellatio and verbum generale.

16. If the two letters before potu belong to the preceding sentence (and ]it could be read instead of ]ut), potu[et om][um might be read, though we should expect enim to be abbreviated; see however l. 20, where, if the supplement is correct, only three letters are missing and we should expect at least four on the analogy of other lines.

21. * should stand for id or in; but the former is too emphatic and leaves quicqutid without a verb, while the latter would give us nam pecuniae appellatione quicqutid in patrimonio in significacione, which, though the verb might be postponed, is an intolerable sentence. It is possible that the scribe intended to write * est, cf. the confusion in l. 13. Alternatively, inest would give good sense, but there is no case of it being abbreviated in this form.

22. That some part of omere or a derivative stood here is likely; but om[e]sio, om[e]tum and om[e]s seem equally possible.

475. GRAECO-LATIN JURISTIC FRAGMENTS.

Acquired in 1917. Frag. (a) 5 x 5 cm. Fifth century.

Two fragments, very probably of the same leaf, of a papyrus codex, with two smaller pieces. The text is written partly in Greek, partly in Latin, and probably belongs to a Greek scholastic work on Roman law, in which quotations from Latin jurists were admitted. Texts of this type are by no means unknown; apart from this text and 476, the two most recent additions are the scholia published by A. Segré in Studi Bonfante III, pp. 421 sq., and the series of questions and answers on Latin legal terms (no doubt used for teaching purposes) edited by Schönauer in Aegyptus, XIII, pp. 621 sq.1 The best-known of these texts and that to which 475 has the closest resemblance, is the ‘Scholia Sinaitica’ (ed. Teubner ser., Seckel-Kuebler, Jurisprudentia Ante-Justiniana, ii, 2), anonymous papyrus fragments of the fifth or sixth century dealing with the ius tutelae and the ius matrimonii; indeed the similarity both in form and content suggests that the two texts belong to the same work.

Greek marginalia—one of which, in ll. 15 sq., gives the only consecutive sense yielded by the fragment—have been added by a second hand, which was also responsible for the note above l. 4. Abbreviations are numerous and not all, as yet, elucidated; the methods of indicating them are so various that I have thought it worth while to reproduce them immediately below the text. A middle point is used either for punctuation or perhaps to

1 See the same scholar’s discussion of the text in Sav. Z. (R. A.), 53 (1933), pp. 451 sq., in which references will be found to similar texts.
indicate (see note to l. 1) the end of a Latin quotation. A sign / is found above l. 11, probably to draw attention to a marginal scholium. The margin of the page was at least 5 cm. wide; there are no means of calculating the dimensions of the codex. The Greek hand, which is upright and regular and shows some signs of Latin influence, is hardly likely to be later than the fifth century, nor does the Latin script demand a later date. The citation of the jurist Vivianus in l. 11 and 12 is a strong, though not conclusive, indication of a date before Justinian.

The subject of fragment (a) recto is apparently libertas fideicommissaria; the verso mentions dos and perhaps legata (see note to l. 10). The Greek scholium on fragment (b) recto is concerned with a will and with dos. We seem, therefore, to have recovered fragments of a treatise de legatis et fideicommissis.

Frag. (a).

Recto.

[...]

ελευθερίαν παρασ( )ιά καὶ ελευθερίας ἐκ τῆς fideicommissarias τερ( )

οραν γαρ τα απογραφ

5 ηζοντι σφικ

Verso.

[...]

ία καλως π(ρας) δελεγ(α)τίσ

προεξ τότε Vvivianus

10 { ἡ γυνῇ Vvivianus

Frag. (b).

Recto.

[...]

[...]

...Sab( ) εἰκοσι τοῦ oδελ... τῆς ταντος επ

20 βενη την τοῦ εκ

gενα τελεστη την τῆς aλακ(ης) καλα... τα. α.

[...]
Perhaps *aetoris* should be read here; *testatoris* at any rate is impossible. *Actoros* might be explained on the ground that the scribe, being more accustomed to Greek than to Latin, wrote by mistake the Greek instead of the Latin genitive termination. Apart from *toros*, which seems impossible in the context, there is no Latin word which could stand here. Apparently the same word recurs in 1. 26 (see note ad loc.). The point after this word is in the papyrus and may indicate a transition from Latin to Greek, as perhaps in 1. 19 from Greek to Latin.

3. *omn* to this form of abbreviation in Latin texts I can find no parallel. In Steffens, *Lateinische Paläographie*, p. xxxiv, abbreviations of the type *m* = *modo*, *n* = *noster* are given, but in this case the mark above the line (which is indistinguishable from the usual mark of short quantity) can hardly be meant for *n*. A similar form of abbreviation may be noticed in the Greek of the *Scholia Sinaitica*, e.g. *k* = *mero* in 52 (19). Perhaps *omni* should be read.

Too many resolutions of *teto* are possible for a conjecture to be worth while.

4. The point after *tau* is in the papyrus. The point after *au* might be for punctuation; but in view of the repeated *taw* it is unlikely.
8. It is not certain whether the letters in this line are Latin or Greek; for νι might be read ξι, but the χ would normally extend a little below the line.

9. The purpose of the short line drawn after τυνα is not clear, unless it is another form of abbreviation.

10. If ρ' is taken, according to normal usage, to stand for praet, the reading in the transcription (which might, however, be praedegatis) must stand. One would wish to read either de legatis or praedegatis; praedegatum dottis is a common expression.

11. Vivianus, a second-century (?) jurist, is chiefly quoted by Ulpian. The sign above τυνα probably refers to a marginal note.

12. The mark above the first V of Vivianus may be intended to indicate a quotation.

15. Aa are probably to be separated; no suitable Greek word suggests itself.

18. κραδεγιω ηρη την προοιμα, i.e. δοειμ λυκτο παυσιμε, λυκαρι; the phrase is common in this connexion.

22. ηπει(ωωος) και(αοο) are found together in the Scholia Sinaitica 10 (27), and in separation elsewhere in the same work.

26. Frag. (c) may possibly have been attached to frag. (a), in which case l. 26 will continue l. 1 after a gap of some letters (and the repetition makes this not improbable) and l. 27 will continue l. 2, while on the verso ll. 28 and 29 will precede ll. 8 and 9, again with a gap of two or three letters intervening. Traces of a line extending to the left can be seen above the to of toros.

476. REGISTER OF CONSTITUTIONES.

Acquired in 1920. 10.9 x 12.4 cm. Fourth to fifth century.

A plate of this text, accompanied with a brief palaeographical account, appeared in E. A. Lowe, Codices Latini Antiquiores, II, no. 225; it was there described as Chronicon

1 So Huscbe, cited in op. cit., p. 462; Girard, Textes de Droit roman, p. 609; Kruger, Collectio Juris Anteloestinian, iii, p. 267.
Graeco-Latinum, a conclusion to which the arrangement of the text in short paragraphs, the numeration and the semi-historical character of the entries (e.g. the διώξ επισκόπησις of 1. 39 suggested an allusion to Eusebius) seemed to point. But a closer study of the text than was then possible revealed that the vocabulary was predominantly legal, and that all the entries, as far as they were intelligible, were concerned with legal matters; hence the suggestion, first made by Dr. H. I. Bell and approved by Professor de Zulueta, that 476 is a fragment of a register or summary of imperial constitutions, has been adopted. For example, the entry of which only the beginning is preserved in 1. 40 sq. is addressed ἀρχοντὶ Ἡσύρου, with which we may compare Cod. Theod. 16, 2, 22 (A.D. 372), addressed ad Paulinum praesidem Epiri Nova. The text is mainly in Greek, but the prescript in 1. 34 and certain key words in all the entries are in Latin, as is the case in the Scholia Sinaitica (see introd. to 475). It is difficult to go beyond this general description as it appears likely that a considerable part of each line is missing and what is left is written in a blurred and faded brown ink. Hence the subject of the entries is, as a rule, obscure; but that of 1. 3-6 is fairly clearly reparatio temporum (ἀναδιότης τῶν χρόνων), that is, the indulgence of extra time that could be granted to a plaintiff or an appellant who had forfeited his claim by having failed to proceed within the utmost period allowed by the general law. The use of proclamation by herald is natural enough in this connexion, but not evidenced elsewhere than in Just. Nov. 112, 3, pr. (see P. Collinet, La procédure par libelle (Paris, 1932), pp. 380, 383-4). Reparatio could be granted by rescript; thus dia rescriptum in 1. 7 may refer to the same subject. For the question of the content of this entry, see note to 1. 10.

The book appears to be written with two columns to the page; but the writing in col. i of the verso and, to a less extent, that in col. ii of the recto is somewhat smaller than that in the other two columns, although by the same hand; hence it is possible that these two columns are really marginal notes. The space between the columns, or between text and notes, is very small. The same scribe wrote both the Greek and the Latin; the former is in a small, square hand, obviously influenced by the Latin script (e.g. the δ is purely Latin in form), the latter is an early variety of half-uncial, in which the r with the upright descending below the line is notable. The margin above the first line of the verso measures 3.5 cm., that above the first line of the recto only 1 cm.

Recto.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recto.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἤγιον . τοῦ . ενετί [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>] . ῥων . ὁ . κ. . κ. . κτα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. ψι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>] εἰςπεσοντι τῶν χρόνων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἰτιδιδοσθαί ῥεράρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>] δια του κεφρικου εσα λοί</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>] . εσα κυνγοροποιοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>] . εν . ίδε δία ῥεσκρίτα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>] [ . . ] [ . . ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>] ´κρατον ἀρχοντι προς εἰς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>] ἔτοις ἐπαρχοις η αυτούς αἱ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. 15 μονον [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. μφ . δυρε [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. ρατ . ὑμα [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. 20 [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. ο επαρχος οι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. και εφι . εστι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. με</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maximo consideranti [35

ra alla κεραυνός τοις εν ...

απο χρήση
οτ i ο επισκο(πο) cumulari ρ(ερ) δε]

40

αρχ(ου)τ(ι) Ηπει ρ(εσσ) διά[39

ρου
μ τη φ [.]. αρχη.

γενομεν( ) σου

4. Reparatio: see Cod. Theod. II, 6; XI, 30, 31, 32, and Cod. Just. VII, 63; a summary of the legislation will be found in Gothofredus Paratitlon to Cod. Theod. XI, 30, for which see the edition of the latter by Ritter (Leipzig, 1736), IV, pp. 202-3. For an example of the use of the phrase ανακήτως των χρόνων see P. Lips 33 = Meyer, Juristische Papyri, 88, 6. References to further literature will be found in M. A. von Bethmann-Hollweg, Der Römische Civilprozess, 3, pp. 237, 330, 337, and Meyer, loc. cit. κεραυνός των χρόνων as a translation of iis qui temporalis excidient occurs in the Basilica (ed. Heimbach), I, p. 441.

5. At the end of this line (ϕισι or (iμε φωλεβρι- might perhaps be read, though ϕ is preferable to ρ.

6. δα is written in Latin characters, as is also the ς of διαφερει in l. 36. There is no sign of abbreviation after the υ of rescriptu, nor is there room for an μ after it.

9. Perhaps λεγεναιρων; but there are other possibilities.

10. αδρέων might be supplied at the end of the line, though this is no more than a guess. The alternative to μ ειν των πλωρ seems more likely to have followed than to have preceded it, in which case the μ γραφ of l. 11 may introduce a parenthesis to the effect that if the praeses select badly (ανως), he may be held responsible. It is possible that we are still dealing with the subject of reparatio, for the plaintiff might forfeit his claim by lapse of time caused by the delays of the court (see Cod. Theod. II, 6, 3).

16. The letter above the ω in this line may be either a correction or else some form of abbreviation, cf. 478, 3, note.

17. The fifth letter in this line resembles the sign often used for ἀραίων (though in l. 31 of this text the head of the ρ is distinctly visible); here it is probably either a correction or an abbreviation. It is just possible that the word in question is rationalis in Greek characters.

25. μ presumably = ὑφαινομαι, as in l. 42.

26. σμ: perhaps for σμρ(εως).

35. One would expect this to be an abbreviation of some word derived from the root of πολις, e.g. πολ(εως), but it is possible that here it is a contracted form of some proper name.
36. ὁβαρᾶς = imperial rescript, is, according to Meyer (op. cit. 54, 18 note), found chiefly in the papyri, but does occur elsewhere, e.g. Digest, XXVII, 1, 2, 4. Here we should expect it to be followed by the name of the emperor or by some other qualification; if it was, probably about half the line was missing.

37. μετοθέου: in the sense to exact, collect as in Justinian, Cod. Just. I, 38, 2 (date uncertain); VII, 51, 5, 4 (A.D. 487); X, 19, 9, 1 (A.D. 496).

39. The letters written above this line are probably by way of annotation rather than correction; the first word may have been ἐνοικίσαντα. Per is abbreviated p.

The numeral παξ appears to belong rather to col. i than to col. ii. If it belongs to col. ii, it is written at the end, not at the beginning of a paragraph, unless this line begins a new entry; but if so, it consists of one line only and there is no space between it and the preceding entry. παξ, however, is clearly placed against l. 40; παξ probably appears in the position it does because the scribe did not insert it until the paragraph had been written and then found he had not left enough space between the columns.

40. The letter read as an s after con might be a mark of abbreviation.

477. CICERO, DIVINATIO IN Q. CAECILIUM.

Acquired in 1920. 40.3 x 29 cm. Fifth century.

This bifolium, containing part of sections 35-7 and 44-6 of the Divinatio, is the most substantial contribution to the text of the Verrines yet made by the papyri; the other fragments of these speeches are P. S. I. 20 (II, 1, 60-3), P. Iand. V, 90 (II, 2, 3-4), P. Oxy. VIII, 1097 (II, 1, 1-4), and X, 1251 (II, 2, 3, and 12). The bifolium must have been the one next to the centre of the quire, as the amount of text intervening between the two leaves would occupy exactly four pages. An intact leaf probably measured 20.5 x 29 cm., with an upper margin of 5 cm. and a lower margin of 6 cm. The text is written in a consistent and regular half-uncial (except for a which is uncial), assigned by Dr. E. A. Lowe to the fifth century (a plate showing part of Folio 2 verso, with a brief description, has appeared in his Codices Latini Antiquiores, II, no. 226); the hand is not unlike that of P. S. I. 20, but is heavier and more regular. The scribe used the usual red-brown ink of the period; parts of the text were only legible with the help of a mercury vapour lamp, which also disclosed the existence of some scholia barely visible to the naked eye. At the end of sentences, where the pause in sense is considerable, the writer leaves a gap of some four or five letters; a new section (according to his system) always begins on a new line and with an enlarged initial letter projecting into the margin. The text has been heavily annotated, the bulk of the notes and glosses being written in a small, slightly sloping Greek hand, probably contemporary with the text, which has faded badly. This scribe (B) also wrote Latin, as the third and fourth lines of the Latin scholium on ll. 13-14, and perhaps also dicere in l. 9, are in his hand. Most of the Latin scholia, however, are attributable to a different scribe (C), who used a black carbon ink and wrote a small, semi-cursive hand. As he has in a few places inked over not only the text but B's scholia as well, he wrote later than B; he is also responsible for the occasional punctuation, for corrections (either by cancellation or expunction) and additions to the text, for some of the marks of long quantity (others were inserted by the original scribe, A), and for one or
two circumflex accents on Latin words. A few Greek glosses on Folio 2 recto were added by another scribe (D), while scopoloso—written in the top left-hand corner of Folio 1 verso—is in yet another hand (E). The Greek annotations, with the exception of the first half of the long note on indicium (I. 13 sq.), and perhaps one or two other notes on the same page, consist of translations or adaptations of the Latin text, less elementary and unintelligent than such notes in Latin papyri often are; the Latin notes, and the few Greek exceptions mentioned above, in manner and occasionally in substance resemble those of Pseudo-Asconius, which are dated to the fourth or fifth century. The scholium on indicium in 477 suggests that it and Pseudo-Asconius may have had a common source, while that on petitiones (I. 53) suggests that the writer was acquainted either with Servius or with a source of Servius.

For the Divinatio and for the Actio Prima we have no MS. of the first class; the tradition rests on Codex Parisinus 7823 (D), written in the fifteenth century and itself copied from Codex Parisinus 7775 (S) of the thirteenth century, before the latter was mutilated. These, in the Teubner edition of A. Klotz, with which the papyrus has been collated, comprise the α class; the β class consists of three MSS., one, P, of the eleventh century, two, Q and H, of the fifteenth century. Hence early evidence for the text is particularly welcome. In five places, obvious errors excluded, 477 gives a reading not recorded elsewhere; of these demonstrarent in I. 18 is perhaps worth consideration, while the surprising addition modo altercandum in I. 45 has much to recommend it; whether the omission of constitutam in I. 25 is regarded as plausible depends on whether in that clause the reading of the MSS., which also seems to have been the reading of the corrector of 477, or the emendation of Gronovius, which is the reading of the first hand of 477, but which demands constitutam, is adopted. On one occasion 477 agrees with the β group against D, in reading me in I. 52—an addition which is generally adopted by editors. It lends no support to two deletions by Hirschfelder. The scribe’s orthography is, on the whole, good; but he writes praesertim for praesertim in I. 28 and constuere for constituere in I. 65; in II. 49–50 numquam and nunquam are found together.

Scholia and corrections in the third hand (C) are printed in italic type.

---

**Folio I. Recto.**

ciebat qu[ei]m [ad]m[oyum] [.] defe[ns]us [ei]s
set non reper[ei]bat — koe est mis[af]feta sunt

Adque ego haec quae [in] medio po[gi]ta sunt
commemor[ro] [si]unt; [all]a magis occulta fur

ta [qua]e ille [ut] [ei]squ[as] creato [animi]os atque
imperus reta[r]g[a]re[t] bi[e]ignissime cum
qua[e]s[t]ore suo communicavit haec tu

scis ad me [ess]e [delata quae] si velim profer

L...
re facile omnes intelligeant vobis in
ter vos al[on] modo volvi[n]t[em] [uiisse
coniun[c]tam sec]d ne pri[a]edam qu[ide]m adhuc
esse [q(uis)am] qu[a]a pro[pli]er si t]i]bi in
dii[ci]m postul[a]s s[ei]ri quod [te]cum una
seeki[nt] con[c]cedo si i d i d i e [p]e[m]itter
sin autem [de accusatione di]cimus con
cedas [o]p]ol][et iis qui nullo suo peccato
imped[i]tur quomium ali(te])rius pecca
ta demonstrare]nt

At vide quantum i[n]ter futurum sit in[t]
mea tuam[que] [a]ccusationem ego
ri cri[i]mini] datu[ri]s a]lum quod te
non

INDEX EST COMMUNIS

nam legibus velutum erat
senato rem forse indicat]
num et eque Romulis[et]
qui si hi opt[ar]ant per[
se]nt o[m]ini[a]m per

cd

(vii)

[scopuloso

pot[esta]te]m tu contra ne quae ille qui
dem fecit o[bi]e[i]s ne qua ex parte con[i]u
ctus cum eo [re]p[eri]e] quid illa
esse [ne] quibus [q]ausa sustin[e]ri pares[e]r
tim tanta null[o modo potest a]lliqua facu
tas agen[lii] a]lliqua dicendi c]onsuetudo a[i]
477. CICERO, DIVINATIO IN Q. CAECILIUM

§ 36

De omne legen

exercit[i]atio [intell[igo] qu[i]am scop[u]

loso diffic[i]qu[e] in loco vel[pl[er] nam] cum

omnis [arrog[antia] [odi]osa est tum illa] inge

nii at[i]que elo[quenti]ae multo molesti[i]

sinq[i] qui[m] [ob rem nihil di[c]o de m]eo in

genio [ueque est quod possim di[c]ere] ne

que si [e]set di[c]em aut enim id m[i]hi [sa]

tis est quod est de me [opinioni]s quidquid

est aut si id parum es[t] eg[o] [m]ai[i]us [i]d [cum

mora[.]] na[o] facere non possum]

De te caecili [i]m [m]e[ner]c[iu]le hoc [extra] a hanc

contentionem certamen[que nostrum]

Folio 2. Verso.

cum quo
disserendum

modo altercandum modo qu[m]ni] ratione

pugnandum certandum qui[e] [sil].


mescam: ita probo ut me ab e[j]o delectari

facilius qu[a]m deci[pi putem passisse num

quam ille me opprimet cons[il]lo nunquam]

ullo ar[tificio perverst] [num] quam inge

njo m[e] suo labefacta[e] a[i]que infirma]

re conabitur novi omnis hominis pe

criptione rationesque di[ic]ind[i], saepe in is]

diem [ae]pe in contrariis caus[iis versus] su]

ad

mus ita contra me ille di[cet] [ quamvis]

sit ingeni[ous ut non nullum etiam]

d[e suo ingenio iud[i]cium fieri arbitretur]

Te vero [ ]

Folio 2. Recto.

utrum di[i]xeris] id contra te futurum qui [ti]

[b]i] estuis qui er[ir]or quae ten[eb]rae [di immo]

tal[les e]nunt homini minime [malo]

Quid [cum] accusati[onis tuae membra di[v]ide

re coeperit] et in digitis, suis singulas par
second person may be due to the
sian to give evidence (against an
be read. In 12 margin
*tame1Z -indicium
of the kind; probably a line or two has fallen out after
text fails us. The comment of Pseudo-Asconius on the passage (T.
the position of a senator who wished to turn
the position of the
II, p.
*CUtUS ipse
accusator de qua re
z'ndlces agi
In our text the third and fourth lines of the Latin were apparently written by the scribe responsible for the
private persons, committed a crime such as murder, if one of those who committed
estion about it, saying,
*quid huiusmodi est. Certae
CUtUS ipse
CUtUS ipse

to speak your part for you. Does not the law prevent you, as a senator, from receiving pardon? For, as
acting for the Sicilians, wish to conduct the prosecution, or do you prefer to hand it over to a man who is in
for you were a partner in his crimes.'

3. The e of ego has been corrected in black ink.
7. There seem to be too few letters to fill the gap; there may have been a correction.
9. The papyrus does not support Hirschfelder's rejection of *vobis.*

There appears to be an omission in the Greek scholium on this passage (l. 9 sqq.). After *vocet* (the
second person may be due to the *vobis inter eos of the text) we should expect *qui plus tuv in enos,* or something
of the kind; probably a line or two has fallen out after *vocet.* Three lines later perhaps be *vocet* should be read. In 12 margin *mora.*m cannot be read.

13. *fauger:* dari MSS. Facere indicium is by no means uncommon, e.g. Cicero, *Pro Flacco,* 40: *sed
tamen indicium fieri videatur cum tabulae illae . . . preferentur;* but where, as here, *indicium* means 'permis
ion to give evidence (against an accomplice)' rather than 'evidence,' *dare* is obviously more suitable. For
the position of the *index* in Roman criminal law, see Mommsen, *Römischen Strafrecht,* 504.

In substance, the scholia attached to 477 agree with that of Pseudo-Asconius on this passage; on one point,
the position of a senator who wished to turn *index,* they appear to have been fuller than the latter, but here the
text fails us. The comment of Pseudo-Asconius on the passage (T. Stangl, *Ciceronis Oratioem Scholiasiae,*
II, p. 197) runs as follows: *Certa sunt in quibus impuniantur indicis datur; in causa priditionis, maiestatis, et si
quid huiusmodi est. Certae enim personae sunt quae indices fieri possint. Itaque neque reprehendam causa per
indices agi solet, neque senatoriala persona potest indicium profiteri salvis legibus. Index est autem qui facinoris
cuius ipse est socius latebras indicat impunitate propria.* *Est autem sensus: *Indice potest esse, si tibi hoc licet; 
accusator de qua re agimus, esse non potes.* Saecus contumeliose tamquam leevum hominem exagitatavit Caecilius.
In our text the third and fourth lines of the Latin were apparently written by the scribe responsible for the
Greek scholium, and were then partly rewritten by the third hand, C, who added the first two lines of Latin. The
second part of the Greek text consists of an explanation and expansion of Cicero's argument. The Greek
might be translated as follows: 'There was a law among the Romans to the effect that when two men, being
private persons, committed a crime such as murder, if one of those who committed the crime gave information
about it, saying, *I have committed this crime with this man,* then the informant was not punished, but as
a reward for the information received a pardon; but he who was denounced was punished. If, however, two
senators committed a crime, then the informant also is punished . . . (l. 21), because it was his duty to give
information. Do you (i.e. Caecilius) wish . . . to take up the case seriously? I (i.e. Cicero) shall be willing
to speak your part for you. Does not the law prevent you, as a senator, from receiving pardon? For, as
a senator, you ought not to have committed this crime. . . . But do you, on the ground that you yourself are
acting for the Sicilians, wish to conduct the prosecution, or do you prefer to hand it over to a man who is in
position to prosecute well and frankly? For I have a clear conscience. You are unable to prosecute him
for you were a partner in his crimes.' It may be noticed that in l. (4) the construction is confused, *de* being
followed by an infinitive in l. (9): in l. (19) *eirpamvptes* might be read, but there is not room for a subse-
quent *who tovou: in l. (23) *eirpa* is an odd expression, and is, according to Liddell & Scott, a form only
found in compounds; but no other reading seems possible and presumably ημι is used here in the sense of speaking.

16. [peca]t: the e has been corrected by C; the original letter cannot be read.

18. demonstrareντ: demonstrare possint MSS. Though the last two letters are blurred, it is quite certain that they were not followed by another word.

19. at: at MSS.

24. Above the n of ne C has written b.

28. Here the original reading seems to have been ne si, which C has corrected to sine, but forgot to cross out the e.

parsertim: I. prassertim.

32. scopuloso: this word was picked out by scribe E, no doubt because of its rarity (this is the only instance of a metaphorical use of the word in prose quoted in the dictionaries, though it occurs elsewhere in Cicero in a different sense), and written in the top left-hand corner of the page. The Greek scholium would appear to be a mere adaptation from the Latin; I have found no instance of the use of σκοπολος or its derivatives parallel to scopuloso here.

36. The scholium written in the margin against this and the subsequent lines is unfortunately too fragmentary to give much sense; nor is it clear in what way the allusions to wealth and position at the end of the scholium are relevant here. In l. 39 read εικαα; after ελεο we might expect either ρηματα or εγκληματα, but neither can be read; the letters appear to be εψη.

42. Part of a stroke by C is visible above the final e of mehercule, perhaps an accent, but more probably meant as an s.

44. Why disserendum should have been written by C above the line, if it already stood in the text, is not clear; perhaps there was a mistake in the initial letters.

45. modo altercandum: these words are not found in any other MS., nor is anything corresponding to them. In favour of retaining them it might be argued (1) that altercandum, either in its non-technical sense of wrangle, quarrel, or in the technical sense of altercario, the sharp question and answer of opposing counsel, does occupy a middle place between disserendum, which implies no more than 'discussion', and pugnandum, and further that, as the text stands in the MSS., the transition is abrupt; (2) that altercari is a rare word—it occurs only twice in Cicero, in Brutus, 159 and 173—and so is unlikely to have crept into the text as a gloss on the common disserendum; (3) that even if it is a gloss, we have to assume a double error to account for the modo. For modo repeated three times, cf. Pro Fonteio, 12.

48. me is omitted by D (Parisinus 783), but is found in MSS. of the β group.

53. For the scholium on petitiones, cf. Servius on Aeneid ix. 437 petitiones enim proprie dicimus impetus gladiatorum.

58. From the end of this line to where Folio 2 Recto begins are 178 letters in Klotz's text, which would occupy exactly 6 lines in our text, thus giving a page of 31 lines.

61. (τι) is not infrequently used in a metaphorical sense: see Liddell & Scott, s.v.

65. A comma has been inserted by C after digitis, to separate it from suis; he also inked over the first s of singulars.

68. Although the letters are blurred, it is clear that 477 read facessieris with D, and not the facessieris of the β group. Priscian (Keil, Grammatici Latini, II, p. 535, 18) quotes the clause with facessieris, but adds that facessieris is found in some MSS.

69. The papyrus does not support Hirschfelder's deletion of at.

72. necessitudo nec constitutum MSS. The omission is probably accidental, as if more and religiones are read, constitutum is essential. But another hand (possibly the same which wrote scopuloso at the top of Folio 2 Verso) has added an m to more and may have done the same in the next line to religiones. The reading more . . . religiones was suggested by Gronovius and has been adopted by Klotz and other editors. It might be argued that the reading morem . . . religionem arose as an attempt to make sense of a text from which, as in 477, constitutum had already been lost. The evidence of the papyrus is interesting as showing that both readings were current in the fifth century.

75. orationis, so the MSS.: orationi Pseudo-Asconius. It is conceivable, but highly unlikely, that in the papyrus the words were divided orationi sib
te.
478. VIRGIL, AENEID I.

Acquired in 1917 and 1920. Frag. (a) 20.8 x 22.9 cm. Fourth century.

This MS. of Aeneid I, accompanied by a word for word Greek translation, has had a chequered history. Fragment (b) was acquired for the Library in 1917; fragments (a) and (c) were purchased from another dealer by the late Professor Grenfell in 1920, while a fourth fragment found its way to Milan and was published in 1927 as Papiri Milanesi I. That this forms part of the same codex as 478 and belongs to the same leaf as fragment (b) I was able to establish by a drawing kindly sent me by its editor, Professor Calderini; as it actually connects with fragment (b)—in several cases a word is divided between Manchester and Milan—I have, with his permission, republished the text here (ll. 124-31 and 145-51; words or letters extant only in the Milan fragment are underlined in this edition).

Both Latin and Greek texts were written by the same scribe, the Latin in a handsome half-uncial (a and e being of the uncial type) in which Greek influence can be noticed, the Greek in a square, heavy hand approximating to the Biblical type. A photograph, with a brief palaeographical description, of fragment (c) has appeared in E. A. Lowe, Codices Latini Antiquiores, II, no. 227. The ink is a light-brown in colour and in places (particularly in fragment (b), where the letters are sometimes invisible, though the surface seems hardly damaged) has faded badly; the reading has been much assisted by the use of a violet ray. A few corrections were made in a similar ink and a semi-cursive script; these have been attributed to a second hand, though the original scribe may have been responsible for them. The majority of corrections, however, were added by a third hand and in a black carbon ink, the use of which in literary papyri of this period is almost confined to corrections. The same hand inserted the paragraphi to mark the line in which the end of the verse came (on an average a verse of Virgil occupies three lines of text), and has occasionally rewritten letters in the text; the occasional marks of long quantity and apices (e.g. in ll. 3, 4, 114; probably only the faded and deranged condition of the papyrus prevents more being recognized) are by the same hand.

Each page contained twelve to thirteen verses of Virgil and, with an average of slightly over three lines of text to a verse, there would have been between thirty-six and forty lines to a page. The upper margin measures 5 cm., and the height and breadth of an intact page of the codex would have been respectively 36 and 24 cm. In fragment (a), verso precedes recto, while in fragments (b) and (c) the reverse is the case; hence we may infer that the latter belonged to the second half of the quire, whereas (a) formed part of the first half. If the codex contained only Aeneid I, it would have consisted of some thirty leaves; but in all probability it was more extensive.

It may seem obvious that a text arranged in this fashion with the Latin and Greek in parallel columns was meant for some scholastic purpose; but it is out of the question that a copy so finely written and on such a scale was the work of a schoolboy. It may perhaps have been a schoolmaster's copy or that of a private student of Virgil. But it is surprising that the orthography of the Greek text is so much worse than that of the Latin; although there was more scope in the former for the corrector, he confined himself largely
to the latter. Even allowing for the fact that vowel changes are common in documents of the period, yet τοιχά for τοιχεία and αυσθηταί for ἀεσθῆται show that the scribe's knowledge of Greek orthography, if not of the language, was uncertain. Further, the translation itself, even if judged by the low standard common, then as now, to word for word translations, simply is not Greek. For example, pars...pars is rendered by μέρος...μέρος, ludis imaginibus by παίζεις εἰκώνιον, corripuere viam by ἀφηρταίον τὴν ὁδόν. The translation is in fact purely mechanical, each word being treated without reference to its context. But it does not stand alone. In 1927 A. Galbiati published in Aevum I, pp. 49–70, from a polyglot and polygraph codex in the Ambrosian Library, a palimpsest (the upper text being Arabic) of parts of Aeneid I and II accompanied by a Greek version. This text is dated to the fourth or early fifth century, and its place of origin is thought to be either Egypt or Syria. It includes, with large gaps, lines 588–741 of Aeneid I, but the only coincidence with 478 is in lines 649–51, where the Greek version in the Ambrosian codex runs (op. cit., p. 59): καὶ περιφασμένων [sic: ? περιφασμένων] προκειμένη σκέπασμα ἀκάθει, κόσμου τῆς Πελοποννήσου Ἑλενῆς, ὦς ἐκείνον ἀπὸ τῶν Μυκηνῶν, τὰ Πέργαμα ὑπὸ τοὺς μεθείκτους καὶ τῶν ἀνυγορθίσων γάμους. This is not identical with the version in 478, but it is close enough to make one suspect a common origin. It should be added that the arrangement of both the Ambrosian text and the Vienna fragment is similar to that in 478. Further, there are two other Virgilian papyri, both of the fifth century which, though they do not contain a complete Latin text with a Greek version, yet give most of the Latin words with their Greek equivalents opposite, only the simpler ones being omitted—P. Oxy. 1099 and P. S. I. 756. In the latter, corripere, mistakenly translated by ἀφαρτάζειν in l. 418 in our text, is correctly rendered by the same word in Aeneid II, 479; similarly δισσθάνειν is used to translate elāpsus in both papyri. Consequently it is unlikely that our translation was the unaided production of an individual, with a merely local circulation; the most likely hypothesis is that there was in general use in the Near East a Virgilian dictionary similar to the Homeric lexica which we know existed; in this the Greek equivalents (sometimes more than one) for the Latin words would be given and were used without any discrimination by the composer of our text. This will explain some of the mistakes in our text (and the Ambrosian translation is on a slightly higher level throughout); but it must have been a bad dictionary that gave δισσθάνειν as the equivalent for elāps. The fact that in 478 where a Latin word is omitted, the corresponding Greek word is also absent, favours this hypothesis.

The relative soundness of the Latin text may be due to the scribe's having had a reliable copy in front of him. There are two omissions, oris in l. 252 and mediusque in l. 638; but the errors that have escaped the corrector are comparatively few. In verse 646 the papyrus lends support to a conjecture of Baehrens which has not found favour with editors; but neither the condemnation of verse 426 by Heyne and Ribbeck nor dii, the reading of Gellius in verse 636 for the dei of the MSS., are supported. For collation the edition

1 See also E. A. Lowe in Classical Review, xxxvi (1922), 154, who refers there to an otherwise unpublished parchment fragment in the Rainer collection at Vienna, containing II. 673–4 of Aeneid V with a Greek translation; Lowe assigns it to the sixth century.

2 It has recently been announced (see Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, xxiii (1936), 214) that among the papyri discovered in 1936 at 'Ainjil in Palestine was a fragment of Virgil with a Greek translation; it would not be surprising if the version was the same as that known from Egypt.
of Ribbeck (1894) and the Oxford Text of Hirtzel have been used. In the transcription letters rewritten by the corrector are in italic type, and words or letters found only in the Milan fragment are underlined; supplements of the Greek version are occasionally admitted exempli gratia.

Frag. (a).

Verso.

(235) [hinc]

[foliē ductores

revocatō

[a] sanguine Teucrī

5 (236) qui nārē

qui āerras

[omni dicione]

tenerent

(237) (pollūcitus)

10 [quaе te genitor]

[sententia]

(238) [vert[i]t hoc] eq[uidem]

occasum Trojācē

tristesque ruinas

15 (239) so[abar [fa][lis]

cōntraria

fata rependens

(240) nunc cadem

fortūna viros

20 tot cālisibus {cā}

(241) actō[s] insequi[tur

quem da[d][d][s] fī[nem]

rex magne [laborum]

(242) Alν[henor poq[uit]

25 mediis [[]] elapsu[s]

Achivis

(243) Ἴττρυγ(o)s

Recto.

(247) [hic tamen ille]

urbe[n Patabi

30 sedecug locavit

(248) Τευκρορομ et genti

nomen dedit

armaque fixit

(249) [hinc
eevethai ἤγεμονες

avaklēthētōs

apo oοματος τοῦ [Τευκρον] oitine την θαλασσαν

oïtines χώρας

[με]α en eγουσία

[i]ερετίμητη

[ε]ιγγγγγιω

[πε ο]ε γνώμη

[i]α] γεννητωρ στρεφει

[touι]η μεν ουν

[tην σ]ήλθοραν της Τροιας

[kai τ]λημβρας συμπτωσεις

[παρεμθήρημμην μοιραις

[tas eναρτιας

μο[κ]ρας [αφρουσθηθομε]πη[η]

υν η [αυν]

toχὴ το[ις] ανδρον

tosau[n]a [ψ]υκθορη]ς

ελασθε[ς] επ[ται]

ποιον δίδωσ τε[λοις]

βασιλευ μεγιστε [ποιων]

Αυθενήρ θύο[αι]

εν μεσον ολισθανοφη]

των Αχεων

eις τους Ευλλυρικους

(250) [hinc]
eυταυθη ομης εκεινος]

την τολιν Πατωλιουν]

και εδρας ιδρυσεν

tων Τρωων και το

ονομα δεδωκεν

και οπλα επηξεν
(249) Troia n[tir]nsc
placid comp[og]tus
pace qui'escit
(250) nos tua progen[ies]
caeli quibus
abnus arcem
(251) navibus a[t]miss[s]i
infraendum unius
(252) ob iram pr[odim]ur
adque Ital[i]s
longe disjungimus
(253) hic pieta[ti]s ho[nos]
sic nos [i]n sceptra
repons
(254) oili subsidens
[hominum s]ator
(255) vultu qua caelum
tempestatesque
serenat
(256) oscula libavit

55 [ille ubi matre]m
(406) [agnovi]:
[tali fugien]tem
[voce s]eeptus est
(407) [quid natu[m] totiens
(408) [crudelli]s tu quoque
(409) [falsis lydis]
[imaginationibus]
[cur d]exterae
[un]ger]e dextram
65 [non] da[jur]
[ac vera]s audiere
[et red]dere] voces
(410) [talibus] incus[at]
[gressum]que
70 [ad moenia]
(411) [tendit at Venus]
[obsuro]
gradien[ti]s

478. VIRGIL, AENEID I

Frag. (b).

Recto.

[Ille ubi matrem]
[agnovi]:
[tali fugiendam]
[voce s]ecutus est
[quid natum]
totiens
[cruelium]
[quoque]
[falsis lycis]
imaginationibus
[cur dexterae]
[ungere] dextram
[non daer]
[ac vera]s audire
[et reddere] voces
[talibus] incusat
[gressum]que
[ad moenia]
[tendit at Venus]
[obsuro]
gradiens
[aere saep]sit

75 (412) [et] multo nebulae
 [circum dea
 [fudit amicu
 (413) [cernere ne quis
 [eos ne quis

80 [contingere p]osset []
 (414) [molirive mor]am []
 [aut venien]i []

(418) corripuere
 viam interea

85 Qua semita
 (419) monstrat: iamque
 ascendebant collem
 Qui plurimus urbi
 (420) imminet

adversasque
 äspectan;i;
 [desuper] a[rces]
 (421) [miratur molem]
 [Aeneas]

90 [magalia quo]ndam
 (422) [miratur po]las
 [strepitum]que
 [et strata] viar]m]
 (423) [instant ar]qent[æ]

100 [Tyrr]i par[j]
 [ducere m]uros
 (424) [molirique a]rcem
 [et manibus]
 [subvolvere saxa]

105 (425) [pars optare]
 [locum tecto et]
 [concludere]
 (426) [sulco iura]
 [magistratusque]

110 [legunt sanctumque

Verso.

[phi]pa(osan]
 
[n] ofor [en toui]
 
[di e] arpa[os]
 
[deloi le]. [.joi].
 
[ariqra]o to] [lo]o]
 
 
[e]pi]i]
 
[akropolei]
 
[ba]ma[ei t]o] [meg]hos]
 
[o Aivnas]
 
[kalabas po]e]
 
[ba]ma[ei to] [palas]
 
[ka] to] bo]bo]
 
[ka] [a]v[as o[
 
[et] hi[s] prothmioi]
 
[oi Tyriai [meros]
 
[anagyn [a] tei]
 
[ka] [qhesa]
 
[ka] [qhesa]
 
[to] [a]kropolei]
 
[ka] [qhesa]
 
[ta] [qhesa]
 
[u]kulwdein] [hous]
 
[meros elswai]
 
[tou] [to] [qeska]
 
[or] [qhesa]
 
[to] [a]laki [novous]
 
[ka] [qhesa]
 
[ek][e]f[eswai] [ka] [qesv]
478. **VIRGIL, AENEID I**

**Frag. (c).**

**Recto.**

(633) nec minus interea

(sociles 'ad litora' mittu[n]t')

[634] [viginti] taurus

[magnorum horrentia]

115 (635) [terga su]num

[centum cum spectibus]

(636) [agnos munera]

[laetitiamque dei]

(637) [at domus]

120 [interior]

[regali]

[spelendi]da

[luxu]

(638) in[i]stituitur

[par]ant

convivia

125 tectis

(639) arte laboratae

vestes

(640) ostroque

130 super[rbo ingen]s

oude η[σον εν τονω]

[σεκ][πη[μ]]

tous έταιρους pros aktau]

εικοσi biou]

meγ[a]lyon φρι[σιο]rya

έστιον

[οιατά] γων

εκάστων μετα των μνηρον]

[ελάβο]ν δορά

[και] λαρια[ν του πει]

αλλα δη ο οικος

ο εσωτερος

βασιλικη

λαμπρα

πολυτελα

καταρην[

εγκαζουσιν

συμποσια

στε(μη)γας

τεχνη με[λημεναι]

αισθηταις

πορφυρα

[...]

**Verso.**

(645) [ipsumque ad] ηοεnia

(646) [ducat omnis in] ascandi

135 c[aro]

s[tat] c[ura]

(647) parentis[ 'mu]nera]

praeterea Lilia[vis]

έρε[pta]

(648) ruinis ferre iub[et]

140 pallam [ί]signis

auroque rigente[m]

(649) et circum[tεχτυμ

croceo

velamen

145 acantho

(650) ornatus Argiva[e]

αυτον τε προς τα τεχ

[ε]ξε μερις αν Α[θηκα]σω

τημω

ισταται φρω[νη]

πα[τρος δορι[α] προς τονω]

αρπαξων

αρχ ἡλκων συμ

πτωσεων λεγει φερειν

παλ]λων σημειω

και χριστω στερεαν]

και περιφαινομεν]

ουκ

κροκ[ιω]

περιπεταισμαι[α]

ακαθινω

κοσμους της Ελληνικ]
Helenae
quos illa

150 [cum pete]ret
[inconcesso]que

1. It is surprising that so short a word should have occupied an entire line; but the reading seems to be
demanded by the Greek.
2. 1. ἡμέρας.
3. 1. ἀπελευθέρας.
4. ρουμαρος: more likely due to a confusion between αἴμα and δρομα on the part of the translator than to
a reading nomine—not vouched for elsewhere—in the original.
7. [μ]α: no other supplement is possible with the space at our disposal. It is not necessary to infer that
the papyrus read ἔμα (an otherwise unknown reading) for ὡμῆ; but it may be cited in support of the reading
omnia (with Myc and Servius) against omni (F') or omnes (F').
19. 1. τῆς.
20. The scribe started to write casibus again and the slip escaped the notice of the corrector.
21. 1. ἰασθήναι.
23. We should expect τῶν ποίων: but there is no room for the article and it is possible that ποίων also
was omitted.
25. The reading here is due to a confusion between ἐν μέσῳ and διὰ (or ἐκ) μέσῳ.
26. 1. Ἀχαίων.
27. Ἰλυρίκος: the fourth letter is a γ corresponding in shape to, but smaller than, the Greek upsilon, and
distinct from the scribe's u; it probably occurs again in Mycena (l. 149). 1. ἔλλυρίκος.
39. adniss: adniss MSS. This error seems to be peculiar to the papyrus.
40. [f]miss[s]: a clear case of an error due to dictation. In all MSS. amissis follows infundum.
43. 1. ἀπερ. ἱεράμων: να γενίθλι.
44. ὄρις after διστηγμώρ has been omitted, also the corresponding word in the translation.
45. 1. ἰδεῖται.
46. 1. βασίλεια.
47. Probably read ἀπορίσθης; neither in the active nor the middle does ἀπορίσθημι have the meaning
replace, restore.
At the end of the line are some traces of black ink; they may be an attempt at correction on the part of
the third hand, but are more probably a smudge.
48. 1. ἐκεῖνη ῥηματικών.
49. σπέρμα: in the sense of father is only quoted in Liddell & Scott from Themistius, Orationes
6, 77 b.
53. 1. ἐκεῖνος.
54. The o of oscula was corrected from s and the a from i by the second hand. 1. ἐπεσεις.
55. 1. ἐκεῖνος.
58. The line over est by the third hand was perhaps to indicate that it was misplaced.
61. 1. παίσας.
62. 1. εἰσέκασα.
80. [α]ποτε, so PM etc.: possit GR'ybc.".
83. ἀποργήσω is used to translate corripere in the Virgilian word-list, P. S. I. 756, and in that context
(Aeneid II, 479) appropriately.
85. It is not clear why the initial q of this line, as also that of line 88, should be enlarged and project into
the margin.
478. VIRGIL, AENEID I

86. Whatever stood in the Greek version after ὃς ἴδεν, neither ἥν nor ἧν formed a part of it.
88. 1. ἠδέαν.
89. 1. ἐπίκειται.
91. aspectat $\text{F}^2$; spectat $\text{F}^1$; aspectat $\text{MPRbc}$. 1. θεοροῦσιν.
93. moles is similarly translated by μεγέθος in P. S. I. 736 (Aeneid II, 497).
99. εὐτραπέλει suggests that the papyrus may have read adstant, an error not quoted from any other MS.: perhaps more probably it is a mistranslation of instant. προθυμοί may overrate the intelligence of the translator; he was quite capable of writing φλεγοντες.
105. 1. ἀκυρία.
108. This line—iura magistratusque legunt sanctumque senatum—condemned by Heyne and Ribbeck, clearly stood in the papyrus.
112. ad hitora: added above the line in a cursive hand; the third t of mittunt was supplied, and the n deleted, by the original scribe. ἀνταστέατε, as also εκατον in l. 115, is written in a cursive hand, which may or may not be that of the original scribe.
113. centum was omitted by the first hand and added by the corrector in cursive writing below horventia, as there was no room between the latter and μεγέθων.
116. pinguis omitted by the first hand may well have been added by the corrector above the line. μημερίων: 1. μημερίων.
118. 1. θεός. It is clear that the papyrus agreed with the MSS. in reading dei, in place of the dii (=diei) of Galliius.
122. 1. λαμπάς: the reading was probably influenced by splendida.
125. 1. τρισθάλώσωμ. The Milan fragment makes it clear that medisique was omitted.
129. 1. ἑσπέρεις.
132. 1. ὁλίγη.
133. Ascanio: added in a semi-cursive by the second hand.
134. τῆλε: we may infer that this translates caro, which was suggested by Bachens (but has not met with the approval of editors) in place of the cari of the MSS.
138. 1. προκουσέτε.
140. The translator may have had in mind a word πάλα cited in Hesychius as meaning ζωή, but it is more probable that he merely transcribed the Latin.
144. περιστέραμα: cf. Stephanus, Thesaurus, s.v. In spite of its presence in MSS., περιστέραμα has often been changed by editors to παρατέραμα; this instance, where it aptly translates velamen, suggests that it enjoyed an independent existence.
146. Vitelli suggested ἐλπίζετο; but Calderini's ἐλπίζει seems more appropriate to the translator's style.

479. FRAGMENTS OF THE DIGEST.


These fragments belong to what must have been a remarkably handsome codex, written in a large uncial hand on papyrus light in colour and of fine quality. On purely palaeographical grounds the fragments might have been judged contemporary with P. Oxy. 1813, a fragment of the Codex Theodosianus in all probability earlier than A.D. 529, the year in which Justinian's first codex was published; there is a strong resemblance between the hands, but that of 479 is larger and slightly freer. It may further be compared with two other MSS., both of the type which Dr. Lowe would designate the
Byzantine Uncial: the Antinœ fragment of Juvenal, dated by Dr. Lowe to the end of the fifth or the beginning of the sixth century, and, more important, the great Florentine codex of the Pandects. As compared with the latter (perhaps to be dated to the late sixth century), the resemblances are much more striking than the differences; but it should be noticed that in 479, m, as a rule, is less rounded than it is in the Florentine MS.—often the sign of an earlier hand—while g (as in the Antinœ Juvenal) has a long stroke to the left below the line and s has a slight slope to the right as in the Verona Gaius (Steffens, Lat. Pal. 18, fifth century). In general it may be said that 479 gives the impression of a hand freer and less stereotyped than that of the Florentine MS.; but it cannot be said that palaeographical considerations demand a date earlier than the fourth decade of the sixth century.

A complete column of writing would have measured some 22 cm. in height and 20 cm. in width; the page was probably not less than 32 × 26 cm. There were 32 lines to the page, and the average number of letters to the line is 35; there were 38 in lines 11, 12, and 29, and only 32 in line 34. The beginning of each Lex (to which a second hand has added a numeral in Greek) was marked by a large initial letter projecting into the margin, and each Lex began on a fresh line.

The fragments are widely separated; (a) and (b), which have been identified with Digest XXX, 11–13 and 22–6 respectively, though in the latter case the agreement is not complete, belonged to different sheets of papyrus, perhaps to different quires, as two pages must have intervened. The three smaller fragments have not been identified with a known text; but it seems that, unless the text varied considerably from that of the Digest, they do not belong to the same page as either (a) or (b). If the large S in l. 38 was the initial letter of a proper name, then it is probable that they are not even from the same book of the Digest.

The discrepancies between fragment (b) and the Digest are three. In the first place the Greek numerals at ll. 11 and 15, added in the margin by a second hand, should, according to the Digest, represent 23 and 24, not 22 and 23. But this is not an important difference, for, to judge by the Florentine MS. (Mommsen, Praefatio, pp. x–xi), there was no official numbering, and in any case mistakes in this matter would be too easy for it to be inferred here that our codex did not contain one of the Digest excerpts, XXX, 1–22. In the second place, in l. 17 the completion of the line from the Digest text would yield a line of 41 letters, considerably above the average. There are, however, several possible explanations, one of which is suggested in the note to l. 17.

The third discrepancy is more serious. In ll. 31–3 we seem to be at Digest XXX, 26, r which runs: si certum corpus heres dare damnatus sit nec fecerit, quominus ibi ubi id esset traderet, si id postea sine dolo et culpa heredis perierit, deterior fit legatarii condicio. Line 31 seems to have begun at sit, and line 33 ends with ęmin honorum, the first words of the next section. It is clear that the papyrus did not contain the same text. If we estimate the lines as having contained at most 38 letters, which is well above the average, there is in l. 31 space for what is missing of the Digest text between damnatus and traderet.

1 Edited, with plate, in the Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, xxi (1935), pp. 199 sq., by C. H. Roberts; references will be found there to other reproductions of hands of this type. A full facsimile of the Florentine codex was published at Rome in 1910, Iustiniani Augusti ... Codex Florentinus.
But the letter following *quominus* cannot be i, as it should be, nor can it be u (on the assumption that the scribe wrote *ubi* directly after *quominus*); we must assume that our codex had at this point a reading otherwise unrecorded. There is, further, another certain variant. In the next line, 32, *loc si* cannot be picked up in the *Digest* text; moreover, from *deret*, with which l. 32 begins, to *num bo*, with which l. 33 ends inclusive, is in the *Digest* text 78 letters, whereas a high estimate of two lines of the papyrus is 76. Of course the lines may have been specially crowded, or the papyrus may have omitted something—not necessarily by error, e.g. *postea* in the *Digest* text is meaningless. But *loc si* shows that there was some positive variation; and though it would not be difficult to rewrite the text so as to produce *hoc si* at the right point,¹ yet this discrepancy raises the question whether our papyrus really was a copy of the *Digest* which was published at the end of A.D. 533. In general, corruptions are no less probable in an early copy than in a later, but in the present case we have to remember the extreme importance of an accurate text and the precautions laid down by the *Digest* itself in order to secure this. But it is difficult to see what else our papyrus can be, if it is not a fragment of the *Digest*. Eminent scholars have maintained that the rapidity with which under Justinian’s orders the *Digest* was compiled must be explained by the pre-existence of a similar compilation of classical excerpts, which was utilized by Justinian’s commission. In the extreme form of a pre-*Digest* this theory has been rejected by general opinion (cf. W. W. Buckland, *A Textbook of Roman Law*, p. 40, note 1), but the existence of less extensive compilations of the same kind on particular topics, such as *de legatis*, is not in the least improbable (see E. Albertario, *Introduzione storica* (1933), pp. 16 sq., with references there quoted, to which add P. Collinet, *Byzantion*, iii (1926), pp. 1–15, and Buckland, *Juridical Review*, 1936, p. 341). Nevertheless the exact coincidence between our text and the *Digest*, not merely in wording—and in the Vatican fragments small verbal variants are common—but in order of excerpts and in method of inscription at the beginning of each excerpt, and, further, the observance by the papyrus of the introductory constitution of the *Digest*, *Tanta*, s. 22, shown by its avoidance of abbreviation ² and by the numbers of the books cited being written out in clear—all these are arguments, the last a very strong one, for the view that we have in 479 small fragments of a copy of the *Digest* or part of it made within a few years of promulgation. The sumptuousness of the codex points in the same direction.

One noteworthy feature of the papyrus is that, apart from the divergent passage in ll. 31–3, it contains, so far as it can be read, every one of the phrases which modern criticism, as represented by the *Index Interpolationum*, has suspected of being non-classical. It even confirms *quarto* in the inscription of *Lex* 13, which Lenel (*Palingenesia*, II, Pomponius, 439) corrects to *quinto*. But nowadays it is not necessary to consider that interpolations were made by Justinian’s compilers; in many cases they are held to be pre-Justinian. Consequently their presence in our text cannot be used as an argument for its being a copy of the *Digest*; but the absence of an interpolation from a given text may be more significant. In *Lex* 26, 1, Ferrini (Rendic. Ist. Lomb., 33 (1900), p. 699 = Opere, 4, 209) suspected the phrase *postea sine dolo et culpa heredis*; *postea* is meaningless, *eius* is required

¹ It may be noted that there is an inversion of order in the Greek paraphrase at this point, *Basilica*, 44, 1, 26 (ed. Heimbach, iv, 327–32).

² Only one is found: *e for em* at the end of l. 47; this is a mere oversight, as the division *habejem*, ll. 19–20, proves.
instead of heredis, and et culpa is, to say the least, highly suspicious. We have therefore to admit that our variant occurs at a point where interpolation of the Digest text is practically certain.

Frag. (a).

Verso = xxx. 11.

[sua sibi filius obligari] non p(osset ac]
[pater non ut heres sed ut pat]er rog[ari vide]
[tur et ideo si filius rogatu]s sit p[ater post]
[mortem suam quod ad se pe]rven[it ex lega]

Recto = xxx. 12–13.

5 [pertine]re placuit voluntas ergo facit quod]
[in testamen[to scriptum valeat ]
[Idem libro] qua[rto ad Sabinum cum ince]
[tus homo] lega[tus tibi esset heres Stichum]

Frag. (b).

Verso = xxx. 22–4.

[desisset] e[se que]m [ad]mod[um insula legata]
[si col]hust[a esset ærea p]ossit vindicari]

Recto = xxx. 25–6.

[te legati in patris] p[rotestate sit igitur]
[et si iussu patris a]dita [si]t here[ditas imputa]

25 [bitur ei in Falcidia]m
479. FRAGMENTS OF THE DIGEST


17. As it stands, this line with 41 letters is considerably too long, the average number of letters to the line being 35. Hence it is probable that 479 had a different reading—perhaps peperit ... constat.

20. The separation of the final m of habeam from the rest of the word is unusual, but is evidence of the scribe's unwillingness to abbreviate.

38. The s of this line, though it does not project into the margin, as do the initial letters of new excerpts, is double the height of the normal letter. The initial letter of the only proper name that occurs (Sabinus in
II. II and 26) is, in accordance with usual practice, no larger than other letters. It cannot mark the beginning of a new Lex, as there is no Lex in the whole Digest beginning Su with which the traces of the subsequent lines can be reconciled. It might mark the beginning of a new paragraph, though the beginning of a new paragraph in l. 22 is not indicated in this way; or it may be the beginning of a proper name, either of a place or of a party to a case (no jurist seems possible in this context, as Servius Sulpicius is always cited in the Digest as Servius'). But in neither case is it probable that the fragment belonged to Digest XXX.

59. ROPERTY and APPPEA are equally easy to read; the number of possibilities is too large to make speculation profitable.

480-1. MINOR FRAGMENTS.

These two small Latin fragments are included for the sake of completeness; both were acquired in 1917 and were in the same group as 474, 475, and 479, but neither appears to belong to any published Latin papyrus.

480 is written in a regular uncial hand, which may be assigned to the fifth century. There is no trace of writing on the recto; this may be explained on the ground either that the margins (as in 476) were irregular or that a space had been left to mark a division between chapters. It is improbable that a Latin literary text was in this period written on a roll. Appella' in l. 4 suggests that the text may have been legal.

481 is written in a crude mixed uncial hand, probably contemporary with that of 480; the ink is brown and the papyrus exceptionally light in colour. To judge from the way in which l. 1 and 4 project into the margin, the text was divided into short sections; this, and the Greek numeration on the verso, suggest that this text also, like the others with which it was purchased, was juristic.

480.

3-1 x 3-1 cm.  
Fifth century.

PLATE 3.

Verso.

lt tum[
frus pu[
$id ac[
apella[(

481.

2-2 x 3-2 cm.  
Fifth century.

Recto.

filij
.[
$[
ua[

Verso.

5 } al
$[
$
]. $7

1 In 1, 2, 42, 43 he is referred to by Pomponius as Servius Sulpicius; but the passage does not suit this context.
III. NEW CLASSICAL TEXTS (GREEK)

482. FRAGMENT OF A TRAGEDY.

Acquired in 1920. 9.9 x 10.9 cm. Second century. PLATE 4.

Two fragments from the bottom of a column, separated by a small but continuous gap down the centre; the beginning (as a rule, a foot and a half) of each line is missing, and in the upper part the ends of the lines are also wanting. The text is written along the fibres in the square, calligraphic hand of which P. Oxy. 844 is a good example, and may be assigned to the earlier part of the second century; a peculiarity to be noted is the scribe's habit of forming the horizontal bar of an e by bringing round the upper curve, i.e. of writing the letter in a single stroke. Accents are occasionally used; the apostrophe, to mark elision, occurs in l. 14, and the mark of short quantity in l. 11. For punctuation high and middle points are employed. The verso is blank.

There is unfortunately no certain clue whereby to identify the tragedy to which this fragment belonged. But the mention of Telephus in l. 3 may be regarded as certain, and as we also find a chorus sympathetic to him, and urging that an escort be given him across the sea, we can hardly go wrong in assuming that the play described Telephus' attempt to prevail on Achilles to heal his wound, and his own undertaking, in return, to guide the Greeks to Troy. There is nothing to indicate who is the speaker of ll. 1-15. The speaker is clearly sympathetic to Telephus and a person in authority—one of the Greek chieftains (? Odysseus, or perhaps Calchas, cf. Pearson, Fragments of Sophocles, i, p. 96) who is eager for the fleet to sail. According to one form of the legend (see Nauck, TGF.², p. 579, introduction to Euripides' Telephus, and Pearson, op. cit., pp. 94 sq., introduction to the Αχαιόν Σύλλογος), Telephus gained his end by seizing the young Orestes with Clytemnestra's connivance and threatening to kill him were his demands not complied with; the stratagem was successful, and Achilles eventually consented to heal him. To this story Mr. D. L. Page would refer the present fragment; on his theory, the plot is being laid in the dialogue, part of which survives in ll. 1-15. Telephus is to get the fleet on his side; then a second person is to get Telephus into the palace, and, as there has been a proclamation (κεφύκειον) that no foreigner may be admitted, he is dressed as an ἄστρος. Lines 7-10 may be interpreted as meaning that he is to go as a petitioner on the ground that he has been refused justice by the ἄγοι (in some imaginary cause), and thus seize his opportunity to kidnap Orestes; or they may mean, that, since in fact the ἄγοι (Achilles and his supporters) have refused him justice, i.e. have ignored his claims as a suppliant, he is determined, dressed as an ἄστρος, to break into the palace. The latter explanation is perhaps simpler and all that the text demands.
NEW CLASSICAL TEXTS (GREEK)

It is highly improbable that this fragment formed part of Euripides' Telephus (for this play see Nauck, op. cit., and Wilamowitz in BKT. v. 2, p. 69); there are no resolved feet, and neither diction nor style are particularly Euripidean. In Euripides' version Telephus appears, dressed in beggar's rags, as a πάλινρος before the palace, while here he is simply to appear as an ἀστός; nor is it even certain (Pearson, op. cit.) whether the Orestes incident was introduced at all. A Telephus is attributed to Aeschylus by the scholiast to Arist. Ach. 332, in which the seizure of Orestes occurred; Nauck (op. cit., p. 76) regards the attribution as mistaken, but it is upheld by Pearson. There is nothing in our fragment, except possibly the metaphorical use of γνάθος in l. 12, to suggest Aeschylus as the author; if it is by one of the Three at all, then Sophocles would be the likeliest candidate. The story was treated by Sophocles in his Ἀχαιῶν Σῶλος (his Telephus was probably a satyr-play), a fragment of which has already appeared in a Berlin papyrus (BKT. v. 2, p. 64); Pearson (op. cit., p. 96) thinks that the Orestes incident formed no part of the play, but there are no substantial grounds for this view, and hence it is possible that our fragment is part of the same tragedy.

For assistance in editing this fragment I am much indebted to Mr. D. L. Page; in particular the supplements in transcription B are very largely his work.

TRANSCRIPTION A

.......

[...]

[...]

TRANSCRIPTION B

[= πρὸς τό] κοιλίν [ἐρχεται = – – –]
Then, Telephus, go down to the... and reveal this to the sailors and the pilots, appearing suddenly after nightfall: then, friend, the task is thine: go thou as a counsellor to the host. For since, as another. Do thou set forth from this western promontory: for see thou forget not what follows, if our first failing, dares to break into the palace. For he will go as a citizen whom the herald's decree irks no more than thy story is to he, our leaders do from the first deny him the use of Hellene right and law, he, his fortunes (which, one must admit, it would not be easy to fit into the present context) goes' (which, one must admit, it would not be easy to fit into the present context) go's (which, one must admit, it would not be easy to fit into the present context) goes'.

But one and a half feet remain to be filled and I can think of no shorter alternative.

One and a half feet remain to be filled and I can think of no shorter alternative.

The absence of the apostrophe to mark the elision is not of any consequence, since it is omitted after 'on' in l. 12. With the meaning 'as the story goes' (which, one must admit, would not be easy to fit into the present context) ɛtew is commonly omitted.

In the sense of report, news, δῦδος occurs in the singular in Ion 1340 and in the plural in Trachiniæ 67. Here
the sense might be 'as the report goes'. Page's rendering 'so shall thy tale run' is much more attractive, if the future sense of ἐπὶ here is allowed.

For αὐτοὶ cf. Aesch. Suppl. 248: for ἐφανεῖν with the infinitive without ἔφῃ cf. Soph. OT. 129. If a subject for ἑξῶσαι is felt to be necessary διενῆ ὁπεῖ προφῆτα could be read.

The dot of ink which I have interpreted as part of a τ near the end of l. 9 could belong to almost any letter.

10–11. κηρικεῖον (the accent in the papyrus is false) is not cited in the lexica in the sense of herald's edict or proclamation: but it does not seem an impossible extension from its proper meaning and can find support in the γράφῃ κηρικεῖον of Soph. Fr. 784, interpreted by Pearson as 'the written instructions from which the herald makes his proclamation'. Perhaps we should see in δόξει an allusion to the snakes with which the herald's wand was traditionally wreathed. εὐ...πλεον, i.e. not more than any other citizen.

The supplement to l. 11 is not entirely satisfactory; but φηδρῶν or σουδί would be inappropriate as there is no reason why Telephus (especially if dressed as an ἄπολος) should carry the herald's wand. (It should perhaps be noticed that the κηρικεῖον could also be carried by suppliants, v. Stephanus, Thesaurus, s.v.) δόξειν is possible palaeographically, but unhelpful.

12. Of the letter before ωσ all that can be seen is a small stroke, at a slight angle, near the top of the o; a final of this type is sometimes used by the scribe on the upper arm of an κ, and, although there is no sign in the papyrus of the lower arm, κ is slightly more probable than any other letter here. I have been unable to find any verb in -ωσ that would meet the requirements of this line. But χ would not be an impossible reading and even τ and ν cannot be excluded.

Apart from this difficulty, the meaning of the line is by no means clear. γὐθὸς must be used in the sense of rock or promontory in which it occurs once in Greek literature, in Aesch. PF. 726. But what can 'this western promontory' be? The πηδεία implies either that it is visible from the scene of action, or at any rate not very distant. The scene of the play (see introd.) is laid in Argos, or perhaps in the Greek camp at Aulis; in neither case is the meaning of the phrase immediately clear. In the latter case it might refer to the hills west of Argos or conceivably to the coast of the Peloponnesian opposite the long peninsula on which Troezen and Hermione stand, i.e. that stretch of coast might be called 'western' in contrast to the 'eastern' coast near Nauplia.

ἐξαγεῖν: intrans. to go out or away is only quoted from Xenophon and once from Homer (Ζ 726); here it is supplied in the lack of anything better. It is not clear who is the person addressed, perhaps one of the generals (? Odysseus) whose ships are to sail as soon as Telephus' coup is successful. Another interpretation is possible; that the reference in this line is to a signal to be given to the conspirators (the story, as reconstructed here, has two foci of action: the fleet (l. 4), and the palace (l. 10)). In this case the γὐθὸς might conceivably refer to the hills west of Argos: it is, however, more appropriately applied to cliffs.

13. πεφωμικός is completely baffling. I can find no verb to which it can be ascribed, nor a suitable adjective if we divide ἔμπωμικός (as δυντός is prohibited by the metre). A proper name may have stood here; but in the absence of a suitable one I have adopted Page's suggestion that we read εἰ(φ)ομικός—in view of l. 5 a less dangerous solution than might appear.

14. συνεπεργ: cf. e.g. Soph. Ajax 35.
15. σφενδαρχοῦν: not otherwise known in tragedy.
16. νῦν or ὅν νῦν also possible. ξεινος: for the use of this form in tragedy, v. Liddell & Scott (new ed.), s.v.
17. συμπλέυσ: Page. Less likely is συμβλέυσ.

483. FRAGMENT OF OLD COMEDY.

Acquired in 1917. 7.8 x 12.2 cm. Second century. PLATE 5.

Fragment from the lower part of two columns of a papyrus roll; the text is written along the fibres in a neat, rounded uncial of the second century. The scholia, in a small
483. FRAGMENT OF OLD COMEDY

upright semi-cursive, are probably by a second scribe. Change of speakers is indicated as usual by paragraphi; the punctuation, as well as the accent and the apostrophe in l. 10, was probably added by the second hand. The vocabulary suggests that the roll contained a play, no longer extant, of the Old Comedy. The verso is blank.

Col. i. Col. ii.

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ἐων} \\
\text{εὐ} \\
\text{ἡγον ὁδων} \\
\text{ἐν ἕκλατῃ} \\
\text{μοῦσκοτων ἠει} \\
\text{Ἀδερ[.]} \\
\text{τιμβαζετε} \\
\text{πρ[.]} \\
\text{λαμβαζετμ} \\
\text{ἐκφάγοι} \\
\text{παίδιοι} \\
\text{ης} \\
\end{array}
\begin{array}{l}
\text{σι[.]} \\
\text{εἰ[.]} \\
\text{ποι[.]} \\
\text{ολυ[.]} \\
\text{διαν[.]} \\
\text{ορθ[.]} \\
\text{τις ὅ[.]} \\
\text{[. . .][.]} \\
\end{array}
\]

4. The mark above των presumably calls attention to the scholion; ἄ probably = λη(πη), as Lobel suggests; the significance of the line above εὐτι is obscure.

5. μοῦσκοτει occurs in Aristophanes, Lysistrata 593: μοῦσκοτει is only cited from the Scholia to Lycophron, 560. The aeι is slightly below the level of the line and may have been added later. The scholion probably runs ω(τι του) μαλατη, though the α(τ)μ(τ) might stand for the name of a commentator.

7. τιμβάω occurs several times in Aristophanes, Άσπυρδα in Equis 310.

8. The letter I have read as ρ in the scholion might be a ξ: it appears to reach far below the line, unless this is a trace of another scholion in the line below.

10. ἐξισθίῳ is found several times in Aristophanes and rarely elsewhere.

484. FRAGMENT OF A COMEDY.

Acquired in 1920. 12.3 x 8.8 cm. Late first to second century. PLATE 9.

This fragment of papyrus preserves on the verso part of two columns, with upper margin, of a literary text, to be attributed without much doubt to a comedy, although neither play nor author can be determined. On the recto are two fragmentary columns of accounts written in a good cursive hand, more probably of the later first century than of
the early second. Of the first column, little besides numerals survives; the second runs as follows:

\[ \text{Πετεχ\'ων Μάρονος Τετ. ( ) [} \\
\text{ιε (ἔτους) γίνεται (δραχμαί) ἕν το . . . [} \\
\text{Πεσκαμοῦς Παράστου . [} \\
\text{δ.α.β. καὶ (άι) ις β (ἕτους) (γίνεται) (δραχμαί) καὶ} \\
\text{περι( ) τεό] } \\
\]

The fifteenth year may well be that of Domitian, the second that of Nerva; the former is less likely to be Trajan's, as we might expect a reference to a year later than the fifteenth when the second is mentioned so soon after. (In col. i the thirteenth and the fifteenth years occur.) A fragment of Menander's Coneazomenae (P. Ross.-Georg. I, 10) is also written on the verso of an account of the first or second century; but the description of the papyrus leaves little doubt that 484 does not belong to the same MS.

Neither of the two names in this fragment provide any clue to the authorship of the play: Syrus is too common to be significant, while Philostrate is apparently unknown in Greek and Roman comedy. There is no particular reason to connect this fragment with Menander's name, although there is nothing in the language or metre to prohibit us attributing it to him. The situation is almost as vague; the guess may be hazarded that the speaker is just about to set off in pursuit of an intruder who has, perhaps, run off with Philostrate.

The text is written in an attractive and practised book hand with some cursive affinities; its lack of formality and freedom suggest a comparison with texts of the late first rather than of the second century, e.g. P. Ryl. 54, Pl. 4 (which, however, shows consistently an earlier form of ἀ); but the hand has also some points of resemblance with Schubart, Pap. Graec. Berol. 22 b, a document of the year 135. There are no accents, stops, or marks of elision; a change of speaker is indicated in the usual way in l. 17.

This papyrus belonged to the small group (which includes 457, the early fragment of St. John's Gospel) whose origin was stated, in a note in Grenfell's hand, to be either the Fayūm or Oxyrhynchus.

\[ \text{TRANSCRIPTION A} \]

Col. i.

\[ \text{θετικήλωθεν} \]

\[ \text{μετ. στεμουσσαγνου} \]

\[ \text{πος (στεμουσσαγνου) πως} \]

\[ \text{ολιχ. αρτουνουσκου} \]

\[ \text{ολουνακανανυν} \]

\[ \text{κετουσ (σκεμεθασιη) κετα} \]

\[ \text{γρουσουρον μει} \]

Col. ii.

\[ \text{οπωσενεργο[} \]

\[ \text{φιλοστρατητη[} \]

\[ \text{αντιγαροποτα[} \]

\[ \text{μυκρασεμερ . [} \]

\[ \text{φυτουντων[} \]

\[ \text{ουθεναρη} .] \]

\[ \text{ποι[} \]

\[ \text{σχ[} \]

\[ \text{. . . . . . } \]
485. CALLIMACHUS, Iambi.

Acquired in 1920. 6.7 x 6.2 cm. Fourth century.

PLATE 5.

This small fragment of a roll, written in a narrow, compressed hand in reddish brown ink, was immediately identified by Mr. E. Lobel as belonging to the Iambi of Callimachus; l. 4 is already known from the Diogeseis (VII, 19) as the initial verse of the fifth poem in the Iambi. The first three lines of 485 are thus the final lines of Iambi IV, the choliambic poem, the opening line of which is \( \text{E} \) (\( \text{o} \)) \( \gamma \) (\( \text{v} \)) \( \text{a} \) \( \text{r} \) \( \text{e} \) \( \text{a} \) \( \text{t} \) \( \text{a} \) \( \text{t} \). Callimachus, i. 4. Recently a considerable portion of Iambi V has been recovered in P.S.I. 1216.
(originally published, in part, as a fragment of an epode of Archilochus, in *Atene e Roma*, 1933, pp. 7-12); P. Maas in *Gnomon*, 10 (1934), p. 438, originally suggested that this epode should be identified with the poem *Diegesis*, VII, 19, and the full publication has confirmed this suggestion. P.S.I. 1216 contains part of the last ten or eleven lines of *Iambi* IV, but only the final letters of the lines, so that there is no actual join with 485; of the opening lines of *Iambi* V there appears to be no trace in P.S.I. 1216, but ll. 15-17 of the latter may correspond with ll. 8-10 of our text.

4. This line (*Diegesis* VII, 19) was first correctly restored by Lobel (see P. Maas, *Gnomon*, 10 (1934), p. 438); with Lobel's reading of the papyrus the comment of the Diegetes on this poem runs: γραμματευόμενος ἔταξαν τὸν Ἀπόλλωνι, οὗ ὑπὸ Κλέαντος τίνος, ἱμβήκε οὗ τὸν ἄλον μαθητὰς καταγγέλλοντα ἐν ἑπετεῖ εἰνοτέ, ὀμηροειδές τοστιν ἥτις μὴ ἄλλη.


---

**486. EPYLLION ON HERO AND LEANDER.**

Acquired in 1920. 8.4 x 11.6 cm. Late first century. Plate 6.

On the recto of this papyrus are two fragmentary columns of accounts; the first gives the amounts received in aratbae of corn (the highest sum is 16½), the second the names of the payers (among them Νεότερος, Φανίος, Πολύμον). The hand of this document is remarkable for an e formed in two distinct strokes, e, and may be dated in the late first century A.D. The text on the verso, written in an upright, rather loose hand with a few cursive letters, is probably very little later.

The fragment of the hexameter poem on the verso is of some interest as its theme was apparently the story of Hero and Leander, which, apart from a few casual references, first appears in Greek literature in the poem of the grammarian Musaeus, assigned to the
fifth century A.D. (see the edition of A. Ludwich, Kleine Texte, 98). But any hopes that what we have in this papyrus is the berühmtes hellenistisches Gedicht which most editors assume to be the source both of Ovid, Heroides 17 and 18, and of Musaeus' poem, are soon dispelled; style and metre alike forbid us to assign so high a place to this text. This actual copy, written on the verso of an account, may well have been intended for school use, although the hand is hardly that of a schoolboy; the verse itself may be no more than a rhetorical exercise. Yet there are one or two unusual words found both here and in Musaeus which may point to a common source; but, as far as can be seen from this small fragment, this poem bore no resemblance to Ovid's version of the story.

A remarkable feature of the text is that word-division is generally observed (the only exceptions being γενομένηδε in l. 2, καβαστ in l. 6, τετηκεγαρ in l. 9, and before λαβρ[a] in l. 5); this appears to be the first papyrus in which this system is found (cf. Schubart, Das Buch, pp. 80 and 180, and C. H. Roberts, Two Biblical Papyri, pp. 25 sq., for spacing of κόλα in early biblical texts), and, as in the Berlin papyrus mentioned by Schubart, op. cit., p. 180, in which the words are divided by vertical strokes, it is probably to be explained by the use of the text in school.

The scene described in our fragment is probably Leander's final journey and death. The first two lines are probably spoken by Hero, an appeal to the elements to favour her lover, in particular to the stars not to shine and so dim the light of the lamp (cf. τυφλοί in l. 2). The rest would then be a description by the author of the poem, in which the evening star is invoked as Leander’s helper and guide (cf. Musaeus, l. 111 where, after the sunset ἐκ περάνθες δ' ἀνέγειλε βαθύσχος Ἐσπερος ἀστήρ).

Leander is addressed in the second person by the poet (as by Musaeus in l. 86); the peculiar form of his name, Λαυάδρος, which appears in this text and is nowhere else used of the hero of this story, may be explained either as a pseudo-archaism or as a scribal error (cf. ll. 3 and 8).

I am indebted to Mr. E. A. Barber for some helpful suggestions in connexion with this fragment.

---

\[\text{\textit{\textsuperscript{1}} The plural γενομένη prevents us from treating these lines as a prayer for the day to close, cf. Musaeus, 567-8 Ἀφρότερος δὲ | καλλίκεν ἐξορίσατο καπεδύμεν εἰς ἑκόντα Ἰδά.}\]
2. τυφλός: either (i) 'blind to something', metaphorically, or (ii), more probably, 'darkened' as in τυφλός σπάλδος in Anth. Pal. 7. 275. 2.

3. The subject of this line is obscure, but it clearly refers to the sunset. καταδυνεμένος: the π is uncertain, but σ in any case cannot be read.

5. After the second a is an unusually thick downstroke followed by a break in the papyrus; it is probable that the scribe started writing the ρ of παλαι and then crossed it out, or else wrote απαια.

6. ἑπερα. For the representation of Hesperus (and other stars) as young men on horseback cf. RE. s.v. Hesperos (viii. 1, 1253); Hesperus is sometimes portrayed as accompanying the Sun, cf. Nonnus, Dion. xii. 3, xxxviii. 299. This representation of Hesperus is commoner in art than in literature, but cf. Eur. frag. 999 (Nauck) Εὔφοι τιτάξε κεφάλαιον ἀστήρ, and in Latin, Ovid, Am. i. 6, 65, Tibullus, i, 9, 62. Possibly Musaeus had some such passage as this in mind when he wrote λύχνον ἐμὸν μινιόν φασοφόρον ἱπποχήν (218).

8. ] .. δους is also a possible reading.

9. Perhaps καταραθηκὴ Ἀλαμπά as in Musaeus, 301. τετεκε κτλ. This and the following words clearly refer to the flickering lamp (probably l. 10 began with λύχνος), called ἀπτέροι λύχνον in Musaeus, 212, which was extinguished by the storm and was thus the cause of Leander's death (Musaeus, 329 sq.).

10. Perhaps we should put a stop after τελεσκοτας (the word is used of the lamp in Musaeus, 237: οὐκ ὁ δὲ κρυφὸς ἐπελευκάνων ἱπποχήν, and supply εἰς [δ ὁπ αὐτῷ], i.e. at this point Leander addresses the lamp.

487. EPIC FRAGMENT.

The papyri have already given us abundant evidence of the popularity of epic verse (sometimes worse than mediocre) in Egypt, from the earliest times of the Greek occupation (cf. P. Hib. 8 and 9, P. Grenfell II. 5) down to the Byzantine age. The present fragment, another witness to the revival of epic verse in Egypt which had its culmination in Nonnus, is peculiar in that its subject is taken directly from the Odyssey; in this, as far as I know, it is unique. A possible exception in P. Oxy. 1821 (third century A.D.), containing the opening words of nine hexameters in elegiac lines. L. 1 begins νοστατην . [. 1. 4 μοθαλασς δ' απόν [. 1. 6 καὶ τοξα μνηστηρ . . . ? This certainly suggests the return of Odysseus; possibly it is a fragment of the same poem. The greater popularity of the Iliad in Egypt is perhaps reflected in the fragments of hexameter verse where the subject is more or less connected with the story of the Iliad (cf. e.g. the papyrus published by Vitelli in Atene e Roma, vi. 53 (1903), pp. 149 sqq., and the mythological exercises published by Bishop Graves in Hermathena, v (1885), pp. 237-57, and identified by Reitzenstein, Hermes, xxxv (1900), pp. 103-5), but probably this is no more than the general legacy of the Epic Cycle in which naturally enough the story of Odysseus prior to his re-establishment in Ithaca found no place (the story of his return was omitted from the Νέστορ). The present fragment, undistinguished in style and metre and peculiarly disconnected, is perhaps no more than a school theme; possibly (see note on l. 32) it was a collection of extracts or of exercises on special incidents. But it is worth noting that the vocabulary is little influenced by that of Homer (there appears to be no actual reminiscence of the Odyssey), so that it is not a mere hotch-potch of Homeric phrases, and also that, as far as can be seen, the story—the return of Odysseus and his revenge on the suitors—is quite differently handled. On the verso, Odysseus appears to be giving a synopsis of his adventures (or possibly relating
what befell the other Ithacans, probably to Eumaeus, perhaps to Laertes; on the recto, after convincing a hearer of his identity by showing the scar on his thigh (his hearer is probably not Eurycleia to judge from the situation—perhaps Laertes, cf. v 331), he urges his supporters to arm against the suitors.

The hand is rough and irregular, and degenerates into cursive at the ends of the lines; marks of elision are frequent, but breathings, accents, and punctuation are wanting. The papyrus was found among the early Byzantine papyri which formed part of the original purchase made by Dr. Hunt on behalf of Lord Crawford or Mrs. Rylands.

Verso.

Recto.
II. 4 sqq.: ... unhappy Elpenor whom Circe’s palace robbed of life. I will tell tales like unto that (?) of Antiphates and man-devouring Polyphemus ...’
II. 21 sqq.: ... the hardships of Penelope. That thou mayst not be mistrustful, thinking that Odysseus has not returned, thou seest the scar which not even Penelope hath seen. Leave now thy stable, Philoetius: I will release thee from the fear of the Suitors that thou mayst go thine own way with thy kine. I will set thee up thy house in freedom. But do ye others arm yourselves at my side against Eurymachus and the other suitors; their evil ways ye too have known, like unto Telemachus and steadfast Penelope. Herdsman, do thou set forth ...’
5. ἐκλέα: cf. l. 29. There is no authority for this adverbial use; presumably it is formed on the analogy of ἵππα.
8. ἕφορος might be read, but is not particularly convincing; ἕθος (I. ἔθος) may have been intended. After ὄψις[ὁ]ποιοῦ, φτ could equally well be read as φτ, but there is no mark of elision after the τ; ὀγδοῖο: perhaps a pseudo-archaic form of ὀγδόε. The whole passage is so disconnected that I have attempted no reconstruction of ll. 6–9.
10. Perhaps εἰς[ ὅ]δους: i.e. Odysseus discloses his identity to his hearer, Eumaeus or Eurycleia (or do μακελλαὶ and βαλκὸς in ll. 13 and 15 imply that he is talking to Laertes?).
21. [ἀ]γλυματα. Here used in the sense in which Homer occasionally employs ἀθλῷ, cf. ψ 248, 350 (in both passages there is a reference to the sufferings of Penelope).
26. It is not clear to whom ὑμεῖς refers: Philoetius and Telemachus (cf. ll. 24 and 29) are excluded.
32. Before the α are traces of letters deliberately expunged (though the space at the beginning of the line shows no trace of having been written on), but the α looks as though it were part of the present text. If so, it is not improbable that ἀλλὰ should be read, i.e. the text consisted of a series of exercises or extracts.

488. FRAGMENT OF AN ANTHOLOGY.

Acquired in 1917. 2·7 x 1·57 cm. Second century.

On the recto of this papyrus are traces in a very cursive hand, probably of the first half of the second century, of accounts, or perhaps of a register of names; the verso text is in a rounded and neat, but rather small book hand, probably not much later than the hand on the recto. The fragment contains the final words of 38 lines, separated by a gap after l. 9; those after the gap are fairly clearly hexameter verses, probably epic in character, but, unless we assume that τὰχινή (l. 8) is a mistake on the scribe’s part (e.g. for αὶτὰχινῆ), the first nine will not answer to this description. It is possible that these were elegiacs (cf. the short line 3, but l. 5 does not readily suggest a pentameter ending), and that the papyrus...
itself was an anthology of poems in different metres; if, as seems possible, the content of the verses was astrological, 488 would be closely analogous to P.Oxy. 464, a collection of astrological epigrams in hexameters or elegiacs. There are no accents or punctuation; but an apostrophe may be noticed in l. 22. The correction in l. 26 is in the first hand.

8. εἴπερ P. 31. ὦκ P.

17. Πορρωσίς: perhaps a proper name, the planet Mars, which is frequently mentioned by Manetho.
18. τραγωδός (cf. also l. 20) is used by Aeschylus (P. V. 813) of the Egyptian Delta; the allusion may be the same here. It is applied to the stars by Manetho, e.g. i. 346, ii. 348.

489. LYSIAS 'Υπίρ τοῦ Ἐρατοσθένους φίλου and 'Υπίρ 'Ερμήμαχου.

Acquired in 1920. 12.3 x 24 cm. Late third to fourth century A.D. PLATE 10.

This papyrus consists of the inner half of a leaf from a papyrus codex, the other half of which was acquired by the British Museum and published as P. Lond. Inv. 2852 by H. J. M. Milne in J.E.A. xv (1929), pp. 75-7, under the title A New Speech of Lysias. The join is close, so much so that a horizontal strip which projects from the London fragment fits exactly into its place and forms ll. 11-12 of col. i recto, the rest of which is contained in the Rylands papyrus. The London fragment is smaller but much better
preserved than 489, which is considerably more worm-eaten and in parts badly rubbed. (This may perhaps indicate that the separation of the two pieces is not of recent occurrence.) The codex, as was already clear from the London fragment, had two columns to the page, so that the two fragments together provide us with four columns of varying degrees of completeness, of which the Rylands fragment contributes i (with the exception of the horizontal strip already mentioned and the final letters of a few lines) and iv, the London fragment ii and iii. With Mr. Milne’s permission, I have reprinted the London text (with the alterations necessitated by the new fragment in col. i), since the addition to the new speech 'Τερ ἐρυσίμαχον μέναντος ἐν ἀστεί is considerable and it may be of advantage to have all that remains of it assembled together.

For a palaeographical description of the MS. the reader may be referred to Mr. Milne’s article. It may be as well to repeat here that the punctuation is marked only by paragraphi and (irregularly) by spacing, and that apart from the horizontal lines to mark contraction there are no other signs. 489 has preserved the lower margin of the leaf—5 cm. in depth—so that we can more easily calculate the size of the leaf and the number of lines to a column; assuming that the upper margin (which, together with the initial lines of each column, is completely lost) was equivalent to the lower, we can estimate that a page of the codex was c. 32 cm. in height and 25 cm. in width, and that each column consisted of c. 45 lines. Mr. Milne assigns the script to the early fourth century; but although papyrus codices containing non-Christian literature are rare before the fourth century (see, however, in this volume 498 and 549), a certain freedom and absence of the rigid formality common in fourth-century MSS. of this type suggests to me that a date in the later third century should not be excluded. While 489 was not accompanied by any indication of provenance, Mr. Milne was able to assign P. Lond. 2852 definitely to Oxyrhynchus.

As Mr. Milne has pointed out, the text of Oratio I, 'Τερ τοῦ Ἐρασοσθένους φώνου, in our papyrus is older by eight centuries than the Heidelberg codex (Codex Palatinus 88), on which we are mainly dependent for the text of Lysias. His statement, however, that the papyrus does not support the changes proposed by Herwerden now needs qualification as the papyrus clearly gives τὰ τοιαῦτα in l. 15. Divergences from the accepted text of this speech are numerous, but rarely convincing, and our faith in the authority of the papyrus is shaken by the unredeemed confusion in which it is involved in ll. 26 sqq. The text has been collated with that of Hude (Oxford Classical Texts).

The main interest of the papyrus lies in the new speech—'Τερ ἐρυσίμαχον μέναντος ἐν ἀστεί—to which the Rylands fragment makes a substantial contribution. Mr. Milne put forward the attractive suggestion that the Eryximachus for whom it was written was the scholarly and sophistic doctor of the Symposium, nor is it in itself surprising that a member of the Socratic circle should be impeached for sympathy with the oligarchs, nor—even if the speech was complete—would we expect him to mention on such an occasion his relationship to such a suspect body. Against this must be set the very probable hypothesis advanced by Burnet (Greek Philosophy, Part I, p. 190) that the Eryximachus of the Symposium is to be identified with the Eryximachus mentioned by Andocides (I, 35) as being involved together with Acumenus (and that was the name of the physician’s father) and others in the profanation of the mysteries in 415. Andocides further asserts that all those whom he
names in that passage either fled the country or were arrested and executed; that any of them should be living in Athens in 403 or after is somewhat improbable. But the Rylands fragment is, I think, decisive. This makes it clear that the Eryximachus for whom Lysias wrote this speech not only fought at Aegospotami (the context does not allow us to think of any other battle), but was a στρατηγός on that occasion—at least the words τῶν ἠμῶν τριπλάρυμχων in 1. 106 hardly allow of any other interpretation. (Only three of the strategoi of that year are known to have taken part in Aegospotami—Conon, Adeimantus, and Philocles—and though we have the names of eleven strategoi in all for that year, some of these were elected after the battle to fill the gaps left by death or absence; hence there is room for a new strategus, cf. Beloch, Griechische Geschichte, ii. 2, 268, and Krause, Attische Strategecliiste, pp. 14 and 46.) If it is unlikely that the rather professional physician of the Symposium should be elected strategus in 405, it is inconceivable that any one implicated in the affair of 415 should hold that office in 405. I think, therefore, that the identification with the Socratic doctor must be reluctantly abandoned. Nothing is known of any other Eryximachus in this period, although the name is known from IG. II 1 3063 as that of the father of a certain Eryxias who was ἱπποτής sometime between 400 and 350; it is certainly strange that he is not mentioned by any of our authorities for Aegospotami. According to the generally accepted account (Xenophon, Hell. ii. 1, 29; Plutarch, Lysander, 11) Conon’s squadron, together with the Paralus, was the only one to escape. The number of ships is variously given as nine (Xenophon and Plutarch) or ten (Diodorus, xiii. 106), while Lysias (xxi. 11) mentions twelve ships as being saved, one of them being that of his client, another that of his client’s friend Nausimachus. The explanation probably is that Conon’s was the only squadron to evade the enemy; a few other scattered ships made good their escape either direct to Athens, or perhaps to Sestos, where Lysander, the victory over, treated the men with some mercy and sent them back to Athens. None the less it is surprising that Eryximachus, especially if he was a strategus, should return to Athens and go on living there under the restored democracy—it was long before Conon dared to return—and that no more serious charge should be brought against him.

The charge itself—μέιναρτος ἐν δόσει—is peculiar; not only does it appear an indefinite accusation to bring at any time, but after 403 it would seem to involve a flagrant breach of the amnesty issued by the democrats on their return to Athens. That the charge was malicious, perhaps an attempt to enlist political passion in the cause of a private quarrel, at any rate that the political issue was not serious, may be inferred from the fact that such a devoted democrat as Lysias, who had suffered heavily from the persecution of the Thirty, composed the speech. Incidentally, the papyrus may solve a problem connected with Oratio XXI, which goes under the title of Ἀπολογία δοραδικάς. The title of this speech is not improbably spurious and the name of the client for whom it was written is unknown; no specific charge can be clearly deduced from the speech, though it has been thought that the charge was one of unsuitability to hold an office; if so, it is strange that no particular office is named. The situation of Lysias’ client in that speech—he also had saved his

1 It is possible that the Eryximachus of this speech should be identified with the brother-in-law of the Athenian general Chabrias mentioned by Demosthenes, xl. 24; but the latter would have been rather young to have been a strategus at Aegospotami (cf. the stemma of his family in Kirchner, Prosopographia Attica, i, p. 256). I owe the suggestion to Mr. M. N. Tod.
trireme at Aegospotami and voices his claim to his country’s gratitude in much the same language as does Eryximachus—is very similar to that of Eryximachus, and it seems not improbable that in his case, too, the charge was one of ‘staying in the city’. It is clear from another speech, XVI ῥῆθερ Μαντὶδον, which also bears some resemblance to ours, that even as late as 394–89 (when XVI was probably composed) the mere suspicion of connexion with the Thirty was sufficient to arouse prejudice, and the frequent occurrence of the phrase μεῖναι ἑν ἅστει in the speeches of Lysias shows that it was a stock charge regularly hurled against all who had not made their allegiance to the democracy conspicuous by withdrawing to the Peiraeus in 403. No date can be assigned to the speech; XVI shows that it may be as late as fourteen years after the event on which the charge was founded.

In col. i, recto, the few words or letters preserved in the London fragment are printed in heavy type. Accents, breathings and punctuation have been inserted throughout to preserve conformity with the London publication.

Col. i.

... . . . [κλῳ]
[δύναρ] [ἐκκυκλώνυμ] εἶ
[μῦ] τῇ [μέγιστον τῶν] ἄξιο-κεῖνον [ἡν ἐπάνω αὐτῷ]
§ 46 ἡδικήμεοι; ἐπειτὰ παρα-βρακεῖ[σας αὐτὸς μάρτυρι-ρας ἦν] βουλή, ἔβου [μῦ], εἰ-περ ἀδίκος αὐτῶν ἐτε[θήκ-

Col. ii.


§ 48 εἰ δὲ μῆ, πολὺ κάλλειον τοῦς μὲν κειμένους νό-μους ἐξαλείψαι, ἐτέρως

§ 49 ἀξιώματα πολυ[]σσοῦσον. πολὺ 

§ 50 ἐν ἅστει μᾶλλον μὲν ἐξουλομη[θὶ], Ὠ ἀνδρεῖς δικασταῖ, μῆ 

§ 51 δὲν μὴν δημοσίως πρὸς 

§ 52 τὴν πόλιν, εἰ δὲ μῆ, τοῦ-
489. LYSIAS Τοπέρ του Ερατοσθένους φίλου and Τοπέρ Έρευνάχου

το γονύν ἐμαυτῷ συνειδή-
[και ὅτι οὔδεν ἄδικων
[ές ἀγώνα καθήστηκα.

38. ἐπερ Ρ. 41. ἐβαυλομένη Ρ. 44. Ι. πολιτών.

Col. iii.

[. . ]
[. ]
55 [. ]
[. ]
[. ]
[ ]
κατήγορο . . . . . . . ἀπολο-
60 γυνήματι. [οὗ γὰρ διὰ τὴν]
τῶν ἔρθησαν ποιήσεων]
ἀξίω σώζεσθαι ἄλλα
πολὺ μᾶλλον διὰ τὴν ε-
μαντοῦ χρηστότητα. διὰ
65 τούτῳ γὰρ καὶ τῷ σώματι
πολλοὺς ἔπερ οὕμων κύριον·
δίνους ἐκκυψάνεσσα,
καὶ τῶν πατρῴων πολλά

66. ἐπερ ἐμαυς κι Ρ. 69. ἐμας Ρ. 70. ἐπερ Ρ. 76. μὲ Ρ. 79. ἐδ[ Ρ.

Col. iv.

[ . . ]
[ . ]
85 [ . ]
[ . ]
[ . ]
[ . ]
[ . ]
ἐὶ τιμ. [ . ] ἀλλ. [ . ] χεὶς, [ . ]
90 [ . ] α. α. [ . ][ . ][ . ][ . ][ . ] ἐγὼ
δὲ τῆς ἀλήθείας [ . ] ἐστὶν[ . ] τῆς[ . ]
ἀλλαγῆς[ . ][ . ][ . ] ἀπὸ τοῦ
λέ. . [][ . ][ . ][ . ][ . ] ὑπὲρ ἐ-
μαντοῦ[ . ][ . ] ἑταροφόρον ἐ-
95 ἀν ἄξικαθα ἄλεγκτομαι
καὶ χάριμα κομμέσθαι ἐ-
ἀν τούτων[ . ][ . ] ἀδικον ἐ-

P. Lond. Inv. 2852.

41. ἐβαυλομένη Ρ. 44. Ι. πολιτών.

Col. iii.

[. . ]
[. ]
55 [. ]
[. ]
[. ]
[. ]
κατήγορο . . . . . . . ἀπολο-
60 γυνήματι. [οὗ γὰρ διὰ τὴν]
τῶν ἔρθησαν ποιήσεων]
ἀξίω σώζεσθαι ἄλλα
πολὺ μᾶλλον διὰ τὴν ε-
μαντοῦ χρηστότητα. διὰ
65 τούτῳ γὰρ καὶ τῷ σώματι
πολλοὺς ἔπερ οὕμων κύριον·
δίνους ἐκκυψάνεσσα,
καὶ τῶν πατρῴων πολλά

66. ἐπερ ἐμαυς κι Ρ. 69. ἐμας Ρ. 70. ἐπερ Ρ. 76. μὲ Ρ. 79. ἐδ[ Ρ.

Col. iv.

[ . . ]
[ . ]
85 [ . ]
[ . ]
[ . ]
[ . ]
[ . ]
ἐὶ τιμ. [ . ] ἀλλ. [ . ] χεὶς, [ . ]
90 [ . ] α. α. [ . ][ . ][ . ][ . ][ . ] ἐγὼ
δὲ τῆς ἀλήθείας [ . ] ἐστὶν[ . ] τῆς[ . ]
ἀλλαγῆς[ . ][ . ][ . ] ἀπὸ τοῦ
λέ. . [][ . ][ . ][ . ][ . ] ἑταροφόρον ἐ-
95 ἀν ἄξικαθα ἄλεγκτομαι
καὶ χάριμα κομμέσθαι ἐ-
ἀν τούτων[ . ][ . ] ἀδικον ἐ-

P. Ryl. 489.

50 [ . . . . . . . γνωσίμα, ὥς ἀν-
[δρες δικασταὶ, . . . . ] ν
[ ]

100 μαὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς· ἐγὼ γὰρ
τολὴ κακὰ τοιχήματος γοὺς
τολμεῖν κατέπληξεν·

105 καὶ τελευτησάρχης ἔνα ἐκ
tῶν ἐμῶν τριπτηράχραχων[ . ]
. ἀπέλυσα ὑδὴ τῶν τοιχών[ . ]
καθηρημένοις, καὶ ἐ-
πὶ τῶν τριάκοντα, ὡς ἀν.

110 δρας δικασταὶ, οὐδεὶς ἀν
ἐμὲ ἀποδείξαι δύνατο
η βουλεύσατα ἡ ἄρχηρ
ὁράσατα· ἀπαγγέλων δὲ
NEW CLASSICAL TEXTS (GREEK)

αὐτῶν ἔχθρων πνε [τύμων]
κατάλογον τῶν μετὰ Λυσάν(υ)-
115 προσάμενον ἡ δίαμανν κλα-
δροὺ τὺ(ν)τα ἤχγράβαντα
τακτικάπαραμέσα ἡ εἰς τό(ν)
91. τῇ Π. 93. ὑπερ Π. 107. τ. τεχώρ. τοῦ χ. Π. 115. τῇ Π. 117. λισαὶ Π.

35-50. 'On behalf of Eryximachus, charged with having stayed in the city.
I should prefer above all things, gentlemen of the jury, to be exposed to no dangers, either in a private suit against any citizen or in a public suit against the State, but if that is impossible, to have a clear conscience on this point at any rate, that I am in my present dangerous position through no misconduct of my own. This you may know, gentlemen of the jury . . .'

59-82. ' . . . I will say this in answer to the accusation. For I do not base my claim to acquittal so much on the villainy of my enemies as on my own good character. For my object in exposing my person to so many hazards on your behalf and in spending ungrudgingly so much of my inheritance in your interests was that the State might prosper, as far as it lay with me to secure this, and that, were I ever brought into court on a false charge, I might with confidence render an account of my career. You will then easily realize, gentlemen of the jury, that if my accusers had been able to find me out in some private misconduct, they would not have laid at my door the wrongdoings of the Thirty Tyrants . . .'

98-119. ' . . . I will urge in my defence before you what I myself have suffered as a result of my conduct (?). For after inflicting much damage on the enemy I sailed home, thus bringing my own trireme safe out of the battle, and after it was over, at a time when the Walls were already being pulled down, I ransomed one of my own. This you may know, gentlemen of the jury .. .'

3. For reasons of spacing the ψ of the medieval MSS. is preferable to Hude's ἡ.
5. παρακλήσεις: probably corrected from παρακλήσεις.
7. ἐπιβίμων αὐτῶν MSS.
11. διακατα: not found in any of the MSS.
12. The MSS. insert τὸν ἐντεμένων between ὑπερίζω and γενόθηι.
15. With the scanty evidence of the London fragment, Milne concluded that there was no room for Herwerden's supplement τᾶ before ῥοϊάντα—reasonably enough, for as it stands, this line, with twenty-three letters, is longer than any other in the text. No support, however, is given to Herwerden's insertion of κοινῆ after ἄλλα in l. 13.
19. The papyrus supports the other MSS. against ἐξαμαρτήσωσι which is the original reading of X (later corrected). The traces just below the end of this line, which Milne read as γι, and which he thought might be a trace of the alternative reading, can now be seen to be due to the mark of abbreviation over τη(ν) in the subsequent line.
20. σαλ. Here the papyrus supports X against the ἐ of N, and the γε of Με.
21. γεώργη ξυνε ἑεσταο MSS.
25 sqq. τοῖς ἡρῴως the papyrus: ἡθῶν MSS. In these lines the text of the papyrus is seriously corrupt. The true reading is δικαίου τοὺς μὲν φαλάστοντας τὰς εἰς τούς γυναίκας ταῖς ζημιαῖς ζημιῶσον κλ. What happened, presumably, was that τοῖς was first lost and the φαλάστοντας was changed to -εις. What the reading of the papyrus was in l. 27 is quite uncertain; the eighth letter from the end looks rather like a Χ, but if μοιχοῖς is read there is only room for two letters between it and γυναίκας. The MSS. record no trace of any intervening words between γυναίκας and ταῖς. In l. 28 ζημιῶσον cannot have been written in full: there is just room enough to read ζημιῶσον. The MSS. read ζημιῶσον.
29. αὐτῶν MSS.: αὐτῶς (i.e. νόμου) the papyrus: there can be no doubt that the MSS. reading is the correct one.
31. ποιήσωσι MSS.
40. The phrase μὲν μὲν οὔ μενοὺς συγγαύμην
489. ANONYMI PHILIPPICA.

Acquired in 1930.
(a) 10.5 x 16.2 cm. (b) 10.5 x 28.5 cm.
Third century B.C.
Plate 8.

The two fragments comprising the text do not touch at any point, but their relationship can be determined by internal evidence; on the extreme left side of fragment (b) are the final letters of the first eighteen lines of col. ii of fragment (a), while for the lower part of
the same column we have to rely on fragment (b) alone. In all there are parts of three consecutive columns. The text, written along the fibres of the papyrus, is in a hand of a distincively third century type and may in all probability be referred to the early part of that century. The hand may be compared with that of the Elephantine Scola, BKT. V. xv—c. 300 B.C. (for the date see Schubart, Pal., p. 101)—although the ω in the latter is of an earlier type, and also with P. Petr. XXIV (2), a legal document of 270 B.C. The writing is of the free and open type in which individual letters vary so much in size that it is impossible to estimate exactly how many are missing in a given gap: e and θ are both small, ν, ο, σ, μ, and τ all occupy a considerable space (the cross-bar of the last named letter extends further to the left than to the right). There were thirty-one lines to a column; the number of letters in a line varying from thirteen to twenty-one, with an average of about sixteen. In its present condition, at least, neither upper nor lower margin measures more than 2-3 cm. The space between the columns averages c. 1-8 cm.—in one place the last letter of one line (15) must have touched the first letter of another (32). The format is somewhat unusual for the period; as a rule the height of a roll in the third century B.C. was considerably less than 28 cm. (v. Schubart, Das Buch4, p. 57), while such narrow columns of writing are also foreign to the period (ibid, p. 63). There are no points, accents, or other signs; paragraphi occur under lines 53 and 60.

The early date of the papyrus adds considerably to its interest, since it is probably not much more than half a century later than the events it describes. The period covered in these two fragments is the years 340-337: the treatment is cursory to a degree and the style bald. It does not appear to be arranged on definitely annalistic principles, and on this, as on other grounds (e.g. the attention paid to the fortunes of Thebes and Persia), the suggestion that it was an Ἀριστοφάνης may be ruled out (see note to l. 8). Some of its omissions are so startling (e.g. while the defeat of Proxenus and Chares before Amphissa is recorded, no mention is made of the capture of Amphissa itself; the number and treatment of the Theban prisoners after Chaeronea is set down, but no account is given of the terms of peace imposed on Athens and Thebes) that, combined with the abrupt and bare narrative style, they suggest that the present text is no more than the epitome of some longer work. If so, it may well be an abridgement of a Ἀριστοφάνης (see the list in Jacoby, Fr. Gr. Hist. ii, p. 4), a work describing the career and achievements of Philip of Macedon, such as we know both Theopompus and Anaximenes of Lampscus wrote; in favour of the hypothesis it may be mentioned that a distinct bias in Philip's favour is traceable in the account of the treatment of the Theban prisoners (but see note to l. 53), such as might be expected in a work circulating in Ptolemaic Egypt among the second generation of Philip's veterans. A small fragment of an epitome of Theopompus on papyrus has been known for some time (P. Ryl. 19); while in favour of Anaximenes of Lampscus, also author of a Ἀριστοφάνης, it might be urged that part of his treatise of rhetoric has been found on a papyrus of the third century B.C. (P. Hib. 26). The events so briefly dealt with here were recounted by Theopompus in Books 47-57 of his Ἀριστοφάνης and by Anaximenes in Book 8 of his work. The brevity of the present text does not allow us to suppose that it is part of the actual text either of Theopompus or of Anaximenes; indeed the presence of hiatus in our text is sufficient proof of this.
Prof. F. E. Adcock, to whom, with Mr. H. T. Wade Gery, I am much indebted for helpful suggestions in the interpretation and reconstruction of this text, points out that a comparison with the account of the years in Diodorus does not suggest that we have before us any source that he used.
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II sq. '... a battle took place in which Philip was easily victorious and slew their king Ateas. In the magistracy of ... the Athenians marched into Boeotia with their full forces to prevent Philip passing within the Gates. They also (sent an expedition) under the command of Phocion ... .'

II. 18 sq. '... Philip crossed the pass and defeated them. Many of the soldiers he slew and many he captured alive; some few escaped in safety with Chares, the Athenian general. The Athenians and the Thebans and their allies assembled their forces again at Chaeronea and fighting ... .'

II. 49 sq. '... Further he took most of the other Thebans prisoner and imprisoned them with the intention of exacting payment from them. But the rest he discharged, providing each man with journey-money. Finally (? taking pity on them) he sent home (most) of the Thebans as well. After this, the Athenians made a treaty of friendship and alliance with Philip, as did the Peloponnesians, except for the Lacedaemonians who ... .'

3. This line is badly rubbed, and there may be no correction at the end of it; but what looks like a long horizontal line can be seen, which it is difficult to associate with any letters.

4 sq. This brief passage clearly treats of Philip's victory over the Scythians in the winter of 340–339: for a discussion of the campaign cf. the article of A. Momigliano, Dalla spedizione scitica di Filippo alla spedizione scitica di Dario, in Athenaeum (N.S.) xi. 1933, pp. 336 sq. The fullest account is to be found in Justin, IX, i. 9–iii. 3; but the only authority for the death of Ateas, the Scythian king, is Lucian (Macrobi., 10), whose statement is now confirmed by the papyrus.

8. Wade Gery suggests that we might read in this line (Λυσιμαχίδης) ἐπὶ τούτων καλ., Lysimachides being the Athenian archon for 339–338. It would make a very long line, with twenty letters, and it is unlikely that it projected into the margin since the columns are very close together (there is scarcely the space of two letters between col. ii and col. iii at the bottom of the roll). However, the ἐπὶ comes immediately above the θ of θεματικός in the following line, and, if the supplement in that line is correct, there might be room for Λυσιμαχίδης in l. 8. More serious objections are (a) that if the work is annalistic, arranged according to the years of the Athenian archons, the name of the archon for the next year, Chaerondas, should appear before the account of the battle of Chaeronea, i.e. before l. 37, whereas there is no such entry; (b) the work cannot be an 'Archon' devoted simply to Athenian annals; the bias, if any, is in favour of Philip, and in col. iii the writer goes on to describe events in Persia; (c) if the work is an 'Archon', the formula introducing the year's events is unusual; we should either expect the deme name to be given also, i.e. Λυσιμαχίδης 'Ἀχαμενίδης ἐπὶ τούτων (as in Philochorus, Muller, Frag. Graec. Hist. i. p. 206) or else ἐπὶ Λυσιμαχίδησι διάκονος.

On the whole this suggestion seems to me to be unlikely: but επὶ τούτων remains and can hardly refer to anything except to the period of office of some magistrate or to the reign of some monarch. But if we read presuming that Lysimachides' name has already been mentioned, [φασι τούτων ο Ἐπὶ τούτων | αρχον] we are faced with the difficulty that τούτων must refer to the archon of the previous year, Theophrastus, and no such military movements as those attributed to the Athenians in the following lines are known to have been made in this year; indeed, if Philip was engaged with the Scythians and the Thibetians, it would hardly have been necessary to send a force to Thermopylae. (But the passage has other difficulties of its own: v. note to l. 13.) επὶ τούτων [τοῦ τοιχίων] even if the expression is legitimate and if there is room for the letters, is open to much the same objections. Wade Gery's suggestion does escape this historical dilemma; but in view of the objections to which it is open, I find it hard to accept it and prefer to leave the question undecided.

10. παθομετα may be regarded as suspect, (a) because an expedition on this scale is unlikely, (b) because the letters might be thought insufficient to fill the space; but it should be noted that they are all letters which occupy a considerable space.

11. I have filled up this line on the assumption that it and the following lines refer to the winter of 339–338, when Philip, invited to lead the Sacred War against Amphissa, first occupied Cynium and then seized Eleaea, with the result that the Athenians advanced to Eleusis, and later, in alliance with the Thebans, occupied the passes from Phocis to Boeotia and sent a force to protect Amphissa. This would bring the papyrus into accord with what we already know of the history of the war, and in particular would agree well with the mention...
of Phocion in 1.15 who in this year (v. Kirchner, Prosopographia Attica, s.v.) was sent with a fleet to secure the loyalty of the islands (cf. Dem. de Cor. 254). The only difficulty in this view lies in the word παίας in 1.15. It is very hard to believe that παίας can refer to any other place except Thermopylae: παίας could, of course, be used of other passes (the pass to which we expect it to refer here is that of Parapotamii), but hardly without a qualifying adjective. If παίας = Thermopylae, then the reference is to a campaign of 340–359 of which we have no other mention; and Phocion's expedition would be the one undertaken for the relief of Byzantium (but mentioned out of place, after the Scythian war). This seems so improbable that I would prefer to regard παίας as denoting the passes from Phocis to Boeotia which, as we know, were held by Athenian and Theban troops.

14–15. [εἰς Αμφισσαν] would be an attractive supplement were it not that Phocion's name is not connected with any land operations this year. [παίας] perhaps is the most likely supplement; [εἰς Εὔβοιαν] is also possible, though the word order would be rather clumsy. A v before Φωκίων (e.g. [παῖς ὁμαν]) is not very likely as traces of ink can be seen level with the bottom of the φ. Φωκίων might be supplied, but is improbable in the context.

16. [καὶ] is possible, though less likely, reading. In the remaining twelve or thirteen lines of this column the writer probably dealt with the Athenian alliance with Thebes and the sending of the joint expedition under Proxenus and Chares, with ten thousand mercenaries, to defend Amphissa—perhaps, too, with the 'battle on the river' and the 'winter battle' claimed by Demosthenes as Athenian victories (De Cor., 216). 18 sq. It is remarkable that, while describing the defeat of Chares and Proxenus in the spring of 338 (for the ruse by which Philip defeated them see Polyænus, iv. 2. 8), the writer does not mention the result of the victory and the object of the campaign, the capture and destruction of Amphissa; instead (I. 27) he goes on to describe the preliminaries of Chaeronea, without even indicating the effect that the capture of Amphissa had on the allies' position at Elatea.

παρεκλησιν: i.e. the pass between Cynium and Amphissa.

27. There was presumably a paragraphus mark below this line; nothing can be seen owing to a gap in the papyrus.

28. This makes a very long line (twenty-one letters): but there is just room for Ἀθηναῖοι (to judge from the space necessary for πατραίων ὁμαν in l. 21), and the καὶ projects into the margin.

45–9. A satisfactory reconstruction of these lines is difficult. The main difficulty is that in ll. 48–9 there appears to be a statement about the number of Thebans captured; while ll. 49–52 also refer to the number of Thebans captured. It might be thought that the first statement referred to the Sacred Band, and we might then read πατραίων in l. 49, which would be an intelligible variation on the usual account according to which all the members of the Sacred Band fell on the field of battle; but it does not seem possible to fit the words in, as, whatever the letter is before τῶν in l. 48, it cannot be v. Again, the word or words between Ἀθηναῖοι in l. 45 and εἰς Καισαρακοντας ἐλαχίστως τῶν Θήβαιων περισσοτερῶν ἐλαχίστως κτλ. would be an easy enough restoration could it be made to fit with what follows.

49 sq. There seems to be no authoritative statement as to the number of Thebans captured at Chaeronea. Diodorus (xvi. 86, 6) merely says ήμων δὲ καὶ τῶν Βοιωτῶν πολλαὶ μὲν ἀνηρθεῖσαν, ὧν δεύομεν δὲ ἐξωρίζθησαν. Nor is the apparently generous treatment of the Thebans implied in ll. 57–60 consonant either with the statement in Justin (ix. 4) that the Theban prisoners were sold as slaves nor with Philip's treatment of Thebes after the battle. Diodorus (xvi. 87, 3) relates that the Athenian prisoners were discharged δὲν λήπτως, but says nothing of the treatment of the Thebans.

53. Supplied, sensus gratia, by Adcock. Alternatively he suggests that χρυσαμενεος might be preferred, as πράξων would strictly be more correct than πράξων, and points out that, if so, it is even less pro-Philip in tone than χρυσαμενεος.

55. τίνος alone is insufficient to fill the space. διὰδίκες (Adcock) is preferable to προσδίκες.

56. Possibly δραματικος followed by a numeral (not written in full) stood here.

58. The letter after τῶν is not 7, so e.g. τὸ πλῆθος καὶ τοὺς πλείστους cannot be read.

63. Cf. Diod. xvi. 87, 3 εὐθύκεια (ἐν. Philip) πρὸς αὐτὸν φίλαν τε καὶ σημαχίων.

65. For the conduct of the Spartans on this occasion cf. A. W. Pickard-Cambridge in Cambridge Ancient History, VI, ix, p. 266.
67. The letter after μι resembles most a φ or a δ, but a σ is possible.

71 sq. For Persian affairs at this time cf. Arrian, Anab. ii. 14, 2, Diod. xvii. 5, 3, Aelian V.H., vi. 8. Artaxerxes Ochus was poisoned by the eunuch Bagoas in 337, who placed Arses, the murdered man's son, on the throne; Arses himself was murdered by Bagoas in the following year. (For the chronology of this period in Persian history see also P. Oxy. 12, esp. ii. 11 note: the papyrus places the accession of Darius, Arses' successor, in the same year as Chaeronea.)

76. Here we might expect a statement as to the length of Artaxerxes' reign, e.g. περίκοπτον (εξαπατεώντος) ετη ..., but it is not possible to fit εκατό ετοὺς (the number of years usually assigned to Artaxerxes' reign) into the papyrus.

491. FRAGMENT ON THE SECOND PUNIC WAR.

Acquired in 1920. 17 x 27 cm. Second century B.C. PLATE 5.

The date, the authorship, and the contents of this fragment all present considerable difficulties. It consists of part of three columns (of the first only 17, 17 opposite l. 18, and 18 opposite l. 24 survive) written along the fibres in a large, clear, but not calligraphic hand of the type commonly attributed (the good documentary hands of the period are not very different) to the second half of the second century B.C.; it may be compared with BKT. III, no. 9765, p. 30. The verso of the papyrus further supports the attribution of the text on the recto to the second century B.C. On it is written, in the reverse direction to the text on the recto, and in a hand of a type certainly common in the later second century (cf. e.g. P. Teb. 10, dated in 119 B.C.), a list of cleruchic holdings. The name of the cleruch and his father's name, sometimes followed by his age and Ἀπρωνοκλής (possibly these were added in each case; the column is incomplete), is first given; in each case this is followed by a second line, considerably inset, with δ καλής and another word (perhaps περίκοπτες; it can hardly be a proper name, as the initial letter is in each case π and in two περ is clear). The papyrus was one of a group, which included 457, marked as coming 'from the Fayûm or Oxyrhynchus'; in this case Ἀρσιμνοκλής together with the name Σταυρίτης, which is almost confined to the Fayûm, is sufficient evidence of its provenance. We know from the Tebtunis papyri (see Vol. I, pp. 553 sq.) that large numbers of native cleruchs were settled in the Fayûm by Euergetes II in the latter part of his reign after the end of the civil war. Among the names on the verso of 491 there is not one Greek one; this, taken with the palaeographical evidence, suggests that this list may relate to the settlement of Euergetes II. In that case the text on the recto is not likely to have been written later than 130 B.C.

The subject of columns ii and iii of the papyrus is negotiations between Rome and Carthage, carried on during time of war. The mention of Scipio in l. 20 excludes the first Punic War, and it is clear from l. 18 sq. that the Roman army was not in Italy; indeed, it is almost a necessary inference from these lines that it was in Africa. The situation appears to be that an embassy has been sent from Carthage to Rome and that, as a result of this,
FRAGMENT ON THE SECOND PUNIC WAR

some prisoners or hostages are released (?), definite proposals for a treaty are made, and the
Carthaginian embassy returns together with a Roman delegation in order that the necessary
assurances may be given by both sides. The negotiations appear to have been on the point
of being successful, when the bad reception of the terms at Carthage—the text at this point, II. 22 sq., is very uncertain, but it is improbable that the subject of ἀπεσταλὼν in l. 39
was any one but the Carthaginians—put an end to them. The inference from the final lines
of the papyrus is that this led to a renewal of hostilities. The only place-name that appears
in the fragment is of no assistance; for Σιππαίων πόλις (l. 20), unless πόλις be equated with
παρεμβόλη for which I can find no warrant, seems to be quite unknown to both Greek and
Latin writers.

In the Second Punic War there are only two occasions to which the events described in
this papyrus might be attributed; the negotiations carried on through Syphax in the winter
of 204/3 do not come into consideration since Rome was not consulted. The first of these
occasions was in the autumn of 203. Scipio had complied with the Carthaginian request
for an armistice as a prelude to peace negotiations, and a Carthaginian embassy had gone
to Rome; but on the arrival of Hannibal and Mago the Carthaginians broke the armistice
by attacking and seizing a Roman convoy. Polybius’ account of these negotiations is only
preserved in part; there is a gap between his account of Scipio’s capture of Tunis in xiv. 10
and his description of the attack on the Roman convoy in xv. 1. From here on the account
in Polybius is fairly explicit. The Roman Senate had given its approval to the peace terms
and Scipio was informed of their decision; then followed the Carthaginian attack on the
convoy, a protest from Scipio to Carthage and a treacherous attack on Scipio’s delegation,
dismissed without an answer by the Carthaginian assembly, as they were returning from
Carthage. Meanwhile (xv. 4) the Roman and Carthaginian delegations at Rome were re-
turning together and had reached Africa, when Baebius, since the armistice had been broken
in the interval by the Carthaginians, imprisoned the Carthaginian ambassadors; they were
later released and returned to Carthage by Scipio. In two respects this account differs
from the story of the papyrus. In the first place, it is clear from Polybius that the Cartha-
ginian ambassadors did not return independently, whereas in l. 22 it is said that they went
straight to Carthage. More important, it seems to be a reasonable inference from the
latter part of the papyrus that it was the reception of the terms in Carthage after the return
of the ambassadors that led to the renewal of hostilities, not any incident during their
absence, whereas, according to Polybius, there was no formal conclusion to the armistice
such as the papyrus describes.

The other occasion to which these events might be referred is the despatch of Cartha-
ginian plenipotentiaries to Rome after the defeat at Zama in 202, described in Livy, xxx. 38;
Polybius’ account of the peace settlement is not extant. The arrival of the Carthaginian
plenipotentiaries and the Roman delegation is described in xxx. 40; by a decree of the
senate two hundred Carthaginian prisoners were released and Roman legati to act with
Scipio were sent from Rome (id. 43). So far this suits the text of the papyrus admirably;
in particular it may be noted that [αεφέ]ουσίαν in l. 6 is almost certain. But neither Livy
nor, it seems, any other authority, records that the return of the plenipotentiaries to

1 Livy’s version of these negotiations is different; but there seems to be little doubt that Polybius’ account is to be preferred.
Carthage resulted in the renewal of hostilities, though there was certainly discontent (cf. Appian, viii. 55). That the text relates to the Third Punic War is made very unlikely both by the tone of the passage, which implies that the Senate at Rome was willing to grant a treaty to Carthage and that the terms had been discussed, and by the date of the papyrus.

Nor is it any easier to be certain about the authorship of the papyrus. On stylistic grounds alone a case might be made out for Polybius. For example, ἐξαποστέλλειν (l. 12) is a word, not common in other Hellenistic writers, of which Polybius is very fond; in Book III alone it occurs thirty times, whereas ἐποστέλλειν is found only four times and the simple verb never.¹ Other words and phrases which occur in this papyrus and which are characteristic of Polybius’ style, are: οἱ ἀπὸ Ὀλύμπος = οἱ Ὀλυμπαῖοι (l. 18), καθήραν εἰς (l. 19) (for these two instances, see F. Krebs, Die Prāpositionen bei Polybius, pp. 46 and 106–7), ὅρμα = foedus (l. 16). On the other hand, ἀλκημωτεία (l. 6), if correct, is not quoted from Polybius, and σῶν (l. 13), though found, is rare.² A fragment of the Τὰ περὶ ἀνωθανόν of Sosylus, who was the teacher and companion of Hannibal, has already been found on a Ptolemaic papyrus (U. Wilcken, Hermes, 41 (1906), pp. 103 sq.), describing a naval battle between the Carthaginians and the Romans and Massiliots in 217 B.C.; but there are no particular reasons for connecting his name with this papyrus, although that may be due to our almost total ignorance of his work. Supposing that 491 is a fragment from the lost part of Polybius’ history, we should have to conclude that it dealt with the events after Zama, and that the rejection of the peace terms described in col. iii was a mere incident, immediately followed by a reversal of this decision, perhaps on the advice of Hannibal. Another interesting conclusion would follow, for, since Polybius is said to have lived into the eighth decade of the second century, 491 would, in all probability, be a contemporary manuscript—the first of any author of importance that has yet been found. In any case, the mere existence of a papyrus on this subject is (cf. also 501) significant of the interest felt by educated Graeco-Egyptians in the already dominant power of Rome. It is, perhaps, worth recalling that it was in the reign of Euergetes II that Scipio Aemilianus, accompanied by Panaetius, visited Egypt and went up the Nile as far as Memphis.

There is no punctuation in the papyrus, but the end of sections is marked by a paragraphus below the line and a space at the end of the sentence. Line 31 is in all probability the last line of the column; at the top the surface of the papyrus has been completely abraded, so that the number of lines missing cannot be calculated.

¹ See O. Glaser, De ratione quae intercedit inter sermonem Polybii et eum qui in titulis saeculi III, II, I apparat (Giessen, 1894), pp. 33–4.
² Further, Mr. R. L. Beaumont has pointed out to me that τὸ ρέοντος (l. 21) is not common in Polybius and is used only once (xiv. 1. 4) of the Carthaginians, as distinct from other Semites, and that Scipio Africanus is normally referred to as Πολιορκής, though Σκιρίας is found e.g. in xiv. 5. 3. Both exceptions occur in the book dealing with the close of the Second Punic War.
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[..] ev'pneideate

10 [p . . . . .] t'ojus pargge

[..] taz peri ton

[orikwv] e Kazepoete

[labon o'non tions apod]

[tau Karhhevovos kai

15 [palo autow tous apo]

sovetas ta orkia kai

lepseomous par an

tow ogn mev swno apo

Romh's katahrav eis

20 tnu ton Xephev'menos

polov [oi] de Fain

ges ev sev eis tnu

Karhhevovos kai ta

Dionismeria [v]vem

25 tau evrein [.. . .]

(5 lines lost)

[..] oTak [.. . .]

Col. iii.

[..] v]

35 tau [v]

pros autovs apod]

tounv's tous o're

kon's apestelea

40 ferevovas at'v t'v

eirepov tov pol'v

muov toyevov mev on]

45 v aggelthevov[os]

afvtevov [tau]

stratopedous ...

2. mevlepemous is possible, but less likely.

5. Alternatively, afvnev might be supplied, or possibly (see next note) epavvov.

6. There appears to be no other possible supplement here; the word is found in Diodorus Siculus and frequently in the Septuagint, meaning either captivity or body of captives. In the former case epavvov might be supplied and the subsequent genitive (e.g. taw orpavw) might be taken in connexion with it; but the latter meaning is certainly the more natural in this context. But if the sentence ends with alvkalavvov it becomes difficult to fill the gap at the beginning of 1. 7.

10. fapelp or even fapelp might be read, but is hardly more helpful; what is required is a participle in the sense of negotiating.

15. The supplement in this line is shorter by two letters than would be expected: cf. l. 43.

15. afvforov tu orkia must mean to deliver, render, in contrast with the lepsevemous of the next line; I have found no example of this usage with 54vka.

20. No city of this name is known from Greek or Latin sources. It is easy to identify it with the Castra Cornelia, Scipio's camp between Carthage and the mouth of the Bagradas during the winter of 204/3, which became a permanent settlement and is referred to by Ptolemy (iv. 3, 2) and other later writers. But it is difficult to see why Xephev'menos pol's should have been substituted for Karvhevovos parabola, by which the camp is known to Greek writers. To translate 'the city of Scipio', i.e. the city where Scipio was (in 203 he had moved his headquarters to Tunis), is grammatically impossible.

40. ferevovas here must refer to the Roman plenipotentiaries, who had first been to the Roman headquarters and then went on to Carthage.
Acquired in 1920. 13 x 30-5 cm. Fifth century.

In spite of considerable dimensions but little text has survived on this leaf from a papyrus codex; to the inner margin (c. 3 cm.) of the leaf itself, the inner margin of its companion leaf is still attached, but no traces of the text of the second leaf remain. The lower margin measures as much as 6.5 cm. in height, so that the height of the complete page must have been over 32 cm.; it is not possible to calculate how long the lines, and consequently how broad the pages, were. In format then, the book has some pretensions to sumptuousness; nor does the script belie this appearance. The letters, of the square, concise type, are closely packed, stiff and unornamental with drop strokes on the π and the ρ; they become considerably smaller at the ends of lines; the deep μ (of the capital type), the κ formed in two separate strokes, and the φ with a long exaggerated centre stroke deserve notice. It resembles the first hand of the Ascension of Isaiah (P. Amh. 1) and is of the same general type as the Codex Alexandrinus; it may, I think, be assigned to the fifth century. The ink is deep brown; there are no signs except the trema over upsilon. Punctuation may have been indicated by a short space (cf. l. 51).

It is a matter for regret that so little of the text remains, as it seems to have been a historical work dealing with the Persian Wars; on the recto there appears to have been an account of Marathon, on the verso the preliminaries to the campaign of 480–479. I have been unable to associate it with the work of any known author.
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40 ζρωτη . . ω
|σταση τη
| θαλασση
|νο μεν τον
|μπε τον Αθω

45 |υπον νη την
| αιων εκομησε
| παναθηναϊν εφ
|αρισκυν την Ελ

50 λαδα
| Σμενος επερα
| χολ . . [ . . ]
| μεν οι . . . ησ

33. ii P. 45. iii P. 46. υπερ P. 64. υδατος P.

and in 67.

28. τριανω would be a possible reading.
29. The writer may have been describing here how the Athenians refused to have any intercourse with some Greeks (? the Parians) who had helped the Persians in the campaign of Marathon.
30. For the trophy at Marathon cf. Pausanias, I. 32, 5 πεποτηνε και τριανων λιθω λευκων: for its symbolic importance at Athens cf. Arist. Eges. 1334, Vesp. 711 (with Rogers' note ad loc.). It might be referred to as το Μαραθων, το εν Μαραθωνι, or το εν τη Μαραθωνι τροπαυν.
44. ηπε: the scribe certainly wrote θ originally, but what looks like a stroke across the top may indicate that he crossed it out—perhaps intending to write ηπε.

Αθω: the later form of the earlier Αθω.

62 sqq. For the sending of the heralds to Greece by Xerxes when the army was at Sardes see Hdt. vii. 32: for their return, ibid. 131-2.

493. AESOP (?), FABLES.

Acquired in 1917.

Although numerous fragments of the romantic Vita Aesopi have been recovered from Egypt, up till now, with the single exception of a school exercise (P. Grenf. II. 84: identified by W. A. Oldfather in Aegyptus, 10 (1929), p. 255), the Fables themselves have been unrepresented among the papyri.1 As the transmission of the fables, as regards both form and substance, is a matter of much uncertainty, the evidence offered by this papyrus is welcome.2 The gap between Demetrius of Phalerum, who, according to Diog. Laert. v. 80,

2 See Schmidt-Stahlin, Griechische Literaturgeschichte, i, p. 676 sqq., and for the MSS., p. 683, Hausrath in RE. VI, art. Fabel, and W. Port in Bursian, 1933, p. 72 sq. The most recent study is that by B. E. Peery, Studies in the Text History of the Life and Fables of Aesop (Haverford, Penn., 1956), which I was unable to see until after this introduction was written.
made a λόγων Ἀισθετίαν συνάγωγη, and our MSS. tradition is considerable; our earliest MS. is of the late tenth century, and, though the question is debated, it seems likely that the collection of fables ascribed to ‘Aesop’ in our MSS. is substantially the result of a Byzantine recension. Chambry (Ésope, Fables, Paris, 1927, p. xlv), on the contrary, is of the opinion that our collection is on the whole older than the collections made by rhetoricians and may be in substance the collection of Demetrius of Phalerum; for the substantial objections to this view see the review of Chambry’s work by Hausrath, Philologische Wochenschrift, 47 (1927), 1537-46, 1569-75. In connexion with this papyrus it may be pointed out that the fable of the Owl and the Birds, partly preserved in the papyrus (ll. 103-31), is otherwise known to us only from the works of Dio Chrysostom (nos. 105, 106 in Halm’s Teubner text of Aesop) and is consequently omitted by Chambry, who prints only the fables preserved in the codices of Aesop; we may suppose that the form in which the story appears in the papyrus is older than that given by Dio Chrysostom, and also that, if the edition of Demetrius of Phalerum was the standard edition it is sometimes thought to have been, it would probably have included this fable which in the papyrus appears together with fables found in our MSS. of Aesop. This, together with the fact that the version of the fables in the papyrus, which can with certainty be placed in the early imperial age, is completely different from that preserved in the codices of Aesop, makes Chambry’s theory still less tenable.

Such is the difference between the version of the fables given in the papyrus and that of the MSS. recensions (different MSS. often preserve slightly varying forms of the same fable, but all probably derive from a common and not too remote source) that it is hard to posit any direct connexion between them, and for this reason this papyrus has been classed among the new classical texts. Those fables in the papyrus of which enough survives for the story to be identified, are all to be found—as far as the core of the story is concerned—in Halm’s collection; a possible exception is that in ll. 133-52 (see note to l. 133), but the text is too fragmentary for us to arrive at a decision. This degree of similarity granted, the following differences between the papyrus text and that of the MSS. may be noted:

(a) The order in which the fables are written is different. The order given in the MSS. has long been suspect, based as it is on an alphabetical arrangement of the titles; unfortunately, not enough of the papyrus remains to enable us to determine the principle on which they were arranged here. Similarly, in the MSS. the fables of Babrius are arranged alphabetically, whereas in the second-century papyrus, P. Oxy. 1249, there is no trace of such an arrangement.

(b) The form of the fables is different. Instead of the title (e.g. ποιμήν καὶ πρόβατα, Ἡρακλῆς καὶ Πλοῦτος) with which they are introduced in the MSS., in the papyrus each fable starts, as in Babrius, with a προμήθιον, a short sentence stating the moral, e.g. (ll. 75-76) πρὸς των πλούσιων ἢ ἔτι καὶ ποιμηνὶ τὸν λόγον ἐφαρμόζει. The last three words of this formula are invariably used; but once (l. 33) the moral is introduced with κατὰ, instead of with πρὸς. It may be noticed that the initial letter of the προμήθιον always projects into the margin. This in part takes the place of the εἰμιθέαν which commonly appears at the conclusion of each fable in the MSS., and is often introduced by οὗτος (or λόγος) ἑκλοι or some similar phrase. The
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επιμήκων, however, is also represented by a feature peculiar to the papyrus version. In
the two conclusions that survive (ll. 72 sq., 129 sq.), one of the parties in the fable points the
moral and in each case the phrase used suggests that it was a conventional formula: τὴν
γραμμὴν γενεναι ερηκευσι λεγον ουτως (slightly varied in l. 129: cf. also ll. 55-6); then follows
the general application of the story.

(c) The vocabulary of the fables is different; e.g. an unusual word like ραβδικω (l. 38)
in the story of the Shepherd and the Sheep, is not found in any of the MSS. versions of
the story. Other examples are pointed out in the notes.

(d) The whole form and syntax of the fables is different. In one case at least, it seems
likely that a different twist was given to the end of the fable. How widely the versions
vary may be seen from comparing the story of Ἡρακλῆς καὶ Πλοῦτος in the papyrus with the
version of the MSS. (quoted from Halm and given in the note to l. 75).

That the papyrus version can in any way be regarded as the source of the existing
MSS. is highly improbable, nor, if we assumed with Chambry that the text of the latter was
substantially of late Hellenistic date, could we assume that the papyrus text derived from
that; both are probably parallel developments from a common source; for it is clear on
linguistic and other grounds that the papyrus does not give us the text of the old Volksbuch
which, no doubt in several forms, was probably in general circulation before Demetrius of
Phalerum made his recension. The papyrus version might be regarded as that of Demetrius
of Phalerum, a distinction to which it has more claim than the MSS. version; but there is
nothing to prove it. The προμθεία and the concluding moral placed in the mouth of one of
the characters may suggest that this recension was made for the use of rhetoricians.¹

There are three fragments, of which (a) and (b) each contain part of three columns,
(c) part of two columns; I have been unable to establish any connexion between the three.
Altogether fourteen fables are represented, most of them very scantily. The papyrus is in
a very fragile condition, badly frayed at the edges and with the fibres disordered. The
text is written in a handsome hand, upright and angular; it bears a general resemblance
to the Berlin Ninus Romance (Schubart, Paph. Graec. Berol. 18), though less rounded and
elegant. Some of its features recall those of documents of the Augustan period (cf. e.g.,
Schubart, op. cit. 14), and it may be assigned to the first half of the first century A.D. The
column consisted of 29 lines (see note to l. 103); the lower margin is 4.5 cm. in depth.
Each fable begins on a new line and the initial line projects into the margin. There is only
one instance of punctuation (l. 134); corrections and additions have been made by the first
hand. Nothing suggests that the text was used in school. The verso is blank.

For collation the texts of Halm (Teubner) and Chambry (Aesopi Fabulae, recensuit
A. Chambry, Paris, 1925) have been used.

Fragment (a).

Col. i.

[ 21 ]
[ 19 ]

¹ But see Perry, op. cit., p. 172, note 58
NEW CLASSICAL TEXTS (GREEK)

[ c. 17 ] λας αυ γρο
[ c. 12 ] [ . . . . . ] [ . . . . . ]
[ c. 10 ] προσηθεν [. . . . . ] [ . . ]
[ c. 12 ] [ . . . . . ] [ . . . . . ]
[ c. 10 ] οδε λογος εφαρμοζ[ε]ι
[ c. 15 ] [ . . . . . ]
[ c. 16 ] [ . . . . . ]

[ c. 22 ] [ . . . . . ]
[ c. 16 ] λυκε αυ εφη
[ c. 15 ] σημειοθεσ
[ c. 16 ] [ . . . . . ]
[ c. 16 ] [ . . . . . ]

Col. ii.

. . . . . . . .

φερ[. . . . ] [c. 17 ]
πολεμωι . [c. 15 ]
νειστε [c. 17 ]

προς το[ν] ωςχηρουν τον και [αλλον]
.. κα . τι[. . . . ] [ . . ] . λε .

τον οδε λογος εφα[λμοζ]ει [ιπτος]
και ις λειμωνος εκοινων[ου]
ο δε ις ελημαινετηρ τη . . . . . . γε και
τα ποι τοι ιςπερην . . . . . . γηρεν

[ . . . . ] [ρ. . . . . ] [ c. 13 ]
πολλακις δε του [ιπτον . . . . . ]
ν . . [ . . ] [ c. 16 ] [ . . ]
δι . . . . [ . . ] [ c. 16 ]
[ . . . . ] [ . . ] [ c. 17 ]

Col. iii.

. . . . . . . .

[ . . . . ] [κ. . . . . . ]
[ . . . . ] [ . . . . ] [ . . . . ]
[ . . . . ] [ . . . . ] [ . . . . ]
[ . . . . ] [ . . . . ] [ . . . . ]
[ . . . . ] [ . . . . ] [ . . . . ]
[ . . . . ] [ . . . . ] [ . . . . ]
[ . . . . ] [ . . . . ] [ . . . . ]

[κξετα] τον [τον με]ς αλλους εν τοι
οιρτων τους δε φιλους κακως
οδε λογος εφαρμοζει ποιμην θεσ
Fragment (b).
Col. iv.

[ c. 16 ] πληρήσοις
[ c. 10 ] μεγαλοις ουδεις
[ c. 13 ] ἵππον άταρ
[ c. 23 ] το
[ c. 23 ] το
[ c. 21 ] το
[ c. 16 ] μετο του
[ c. 15 ] ούπαρτη
[ c. 9 ] εἰρηκένηθεν λεγὼν
[ c. 20 ] ἰτης γε
[ c. 16 ] }
[ c. 20 ] }
[ c. 19 ] μπαρα
[ c. 22 ] }
[ c. 18 ] πράξεις
[ c. 20 ] }
[ c. 21 ] }
[ c. 19 ] }
[ c. 22 ] }
[ c. 21 ] τη η η
[ c. 20 ] η η
[ c. 16 ] }
[ c. 14 ] }
[ c. 22 ] }

Col. v.

[ c. 12 ] }

[ c. 10 ] ἰτης
τὴν γνωρὶς φαίνεται εἰ [...] 
εἰρήκενας λέγων οὗτος [αμπ] 
ταύτων εκάστους αἰτιάσας θεοὺς
75 πρὸς τὸν πλουσίον ἤρα καὶ τοῦτο [πρὸν] 
οὗ δὲ λόγος εὑρίσκει ὁ Ζεὺς τῷν 
Ἡρακλῆς [ὡς εἰς θεοὺς α. ἔδ.] [...] 
tαί καὶ τῷν αλλούς θεοὺς εἰκαλ 
σεν εὐθείᾳ το δείπνον εὔφυστα δὲ
80 εκάστου τῶν θεῶν ἡπτερβολὴν] 
ησπα[ξετο ο Πραξίλης [τῶν [δε] Πλου] 
τὸν εὐχατον προσινοῦρ [αφοῦ κυ] 
ψας κατώ ο Ηρακλῆς υπ' θροσή] 
γορεόντων αὐτὸν τον Δίος θαμμα 
85 σταύρος καὶ ερατήσαντος τὸν 
Ἡρακλῆς διὰ τ' ἐπιτότο εὑρίσκατο π 
τεκνεινοῦ (οτι ὁ πάτερ εὐφοι 
τουτὸν εὐπρᾶται αἰε μετὰ τῶν 
πονηροτιτῶν αὐθρωπο[ν δὲ]. 
90 στρεβατα καὶ μετὰ τουτ‿ ὑπէ 
βοῦλεμον ἀταρ ὁ Πλουτός εἰπε] 
αὐθρωπε πονηροτατε [...] 
αὐ το Πλουτός παρα[.] [π[. . . . . .] 
μὴ τοι λογοι πα [ [...]] [... ]
95 τ. ὁν τ[. ...] ἰφι μετα[. . . . . . . .] 
[ ę. 13 ] ἱλογ[. . . . . . . . .] 
. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

Col. vi.

8[ ę. 23 ]
[ ę. 24 ]
[ ę. 24 ]
100 [ ę. 24 ]
γερ[ ę. 20 ]
αστ[ ę. 19 ]
. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

Fragment (c).

Col. vii.

[ ę. 22 ] λ.
[ ę. 9 ] [ę. 11 ] λ.
105 [ ę. 8 ] [ę. 12 ]
[ ... ] [ę. 9 ] [ę. 13 ]
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[...]

4. εὐρίσκων καὶ εὐφημοῖς δείκνυσι
[...]

110 [θάκακον των γενεών των ορφήων]
[...]

115 [καὶ τιθομέν] εὐθήν
[...]

120 [καὶ των ολίγων] εἰπέχει σῳδιβουλέων
[...]

125 [καὶ των] γλωσσάκων τούτων προστάσιμοiren
[...]

130 [καὶ τούτων] εἰπέχει σῳδιβουλέων
[...]

Col. viii.

...
NEW CLASSICAL TEXTS (GREEK)

6. As the formula in the next line shows, a new fable began either here or in L. 5; if in the latter, [προς τουν Πηγημαίνα] might be read.

16. This line is level with L. 6 in col. i.

19. This fable, of the wild boar and the horse, who called in man to assist him against his enemy (or How the Horse got his Bridle), is no. 329 in Chambry where it has the title Ἀκτις (Δύρος) καὶ Ἰττος καὶ ἐνικητής. In this form it is extant only in Codex Parisinensis 690, and does not appear in Halm. The same fable appears in a fuller form as Chambry, 144 Ἰττος καὶ εὖς Δύρος from Codex Bodleianus (also omitted in Halm). What is, however, in substance the same story, with a stag taking the place of the wild boar, was included by Halm in his collection (no. 175) from Aristotle, Rhet. ii. 20; here it is said to have been told by Stesichorus to the men of Himera, when they chose Phalaris as their ruler. Fragmentary as the story is in the papyrus, it may be noted that in vocabulary this version differs from all the others; neither κουνώεια, λυμαίνομαι nor τοιλάκες occur in the extant versions.

The moral attached to this fable (as always in the papyrus, placed before the story; in all our MSS. of Aesop, the moral, commonly introduced by ὅτι μέθος οὖς ἀλλοι or ἕξει, follows the story) is different from that in the versions mentioned above. That attached to Chambry, 144 Ἰττος καὶ εὖς Δύρος is: ὅτι ἢμοί οὖς διαλύσαι καὶ ταπεινώσαι ἄνδρα γενέσθω καὶ πρός ᾧνοι [γενέσθαι] τοῦ δικαίου (ἀρματείαν)—which is not particularly suited to this fable; that at the end of Chambry, 329 runs, more suitably: εὖς πολλοὶ δι' ἀλλοτρούς ἐργῆς ἐῳ τοῖς ἐγκοροθεὶς ἄμισους, ἐκατον ἐκέρους σφοράστων. The present moral may be assumed to be directed against the strong man, who lets himself be controlled by others.

24. τοια: the traces suit an η better than any other letter, and τα(ς) τοια cannot be read, even if the plural were admissible. The form can only be set down as an error on the part of the scribe, perhaps due to a confusion with πάνω. For the sense cf. Chambry, 329 τοι ἐν τοῖς πιάρ ἐκαστα τὴν πόνον διαφθέροντως.

34. The traces would suit best the reading φοβοῦσα, although neither φοβοῦσα or even μορυσα can be quite excluded; but as there is no genitive in agreement with the τοῖς of the preceding line, it seems likely that the text is corrupt.

The end of the line has been left blank, as each fable began on a fresh line.

35. The moral of the following fable appears in the MSS. versions (Halm, 378: Chambry, 317) as: οὖς καὶ τῶν ἄρθρων πολλοί, δι' ἄρθρων τοῖς μηδὲ προσήκουσα εὐρήκεις, κατὰ τῶν ὀκτὼν φιλά ἐγκλημάτων. The other two versions given by Chambry differ only slightly in the arrangement of the words and in the syntax, whereas the text in the papyrus clearly belongs to a different tradition.

38. The asyndeton is harsh, even for this type of literature; perhaps we should insert (καί) before αὐξάνει.

βαθώς in this sense, is not a common word: it does not occur in any of the extant versions of this fable.

40. The text in this and the following lines is corrupt to an unusual degree for a literary text of this quality. We may suppose that the original text ran approximately as follows: τὰ δὲ κράβατα περὶ τὰς βαλάνους ἁμαρτήσας καὶ τὰ λαόνοις αὐτοῦ δίψησαν. That the sheep first fought over the acorns is a touch not found in the other versions.
I. to worded; of these, either placed in the mouth of one of the characters in the story, attached to them as an (as in follow it; they may well have been close to one another in some earlier collection. Again, on the analogy of Heracles and both stories, the strong aorist participle of "Hpoos, survives than a few dots sufficient to indicate an upright stroke.

II. the version in the papyrus appears to be the same in substance as that given by Dio tion), but is used in two different forms by Dio to advise them any more, does not appear in the (Halm, a normal line, but some letters may have been omitted. (Halm, no other reading seems plausible. The , which would suggest a confusion between kal and kal: the straight vertical stroke excludes alike or and tou, even if the other traces suited these letters.

III. Though could easily be read, it is difficult to see what part of olygorēo could have stood here, as the η at the end of the line is very probable and ολυγωρη(τω)ν is certainly impossible, nor is there space for ολυγωρης την. Possibly some letters were omitted and written above the line. The supplement at the beginning of the line is a little long, but [ος] would be on the short side.
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128. περιπτέων, from an otherwise unvouched for present form περιπτέω—unless we assume that the text is corrupt and read περιπτεόμενην. η, i.e. ἡ, cf. κατεινα in l. 83.

129. It is a little doubtful whether there is room for λιστή[σσαί]; the fibre on which the σ survives is so loose that its exact position cannot be determined. Near the end of the line the ω has been partly written over the erased π.

130. Instead of λιστή, ἡ might be read.

131. [λέγω-tο] is preferable to φανονται which we might expect here in view of l. 72, as it suits the space better: there is just room for λέγονται, while φανονται would definitely make too long a line. Is a misplaced ἄφθος to be recognized in ἄφθονε; οὖν would be expected.

132. Probably two lines are missing at the head of this column which contained the concluding moral of the fable of the Owl and the Birds.

133. In the scanty fragments that survive there appears to be no clue to the identity of this fable. σφυρα (l. 138) should be of assistance; but a γραλεις figures only in one fable (Halm, 413: Chambry, 346) and, σφυρα apart (the word does occur in the third version of this story given by Chambry), there is no reason to connect it with this text.

134. The point in this line is the only example of punctuation in the papyrus. In the space above the letter between the α and the ζ is what looks like a smooth breathing, but it may be part of an inserted letter.

135. From the little that survives it seems doubtful whether this fable is to be identified with any of those in which the name of Hermes appears in the title. More probably it represents a different version of Ζεύς κριτής (Halm, 152: Chambry, 127), in which Hermes figures as the assistant of Zeus in assessing the iniquities of mankind.

494–500. MISCELLANEOUS FRAGMENTS (VERSE).

The following seven small fragments, all unidentified and all verse, may be conveniently grouped together. All were acquired in 1917, and, with the exception of 498, to which no provenance was assigned, and the two cartonnage fragments, 496 and 499, were all stated to come from Oxyrhynchus.

The first is a fragment from the top of a column, written along the fibres in a broad, regular book-hand with a slight slope to the right. The verso is blank. The verses are hexameters and the subject may be the return of Persephone (cf. καθός in l. 3) to the upper world.

495 very probably belongs to a tragedy. It is written in a large and rounded hand, with a slight backward slope. Accents, &c., are in a second hand; the correction in l. 2 is by the first hand. The verso is blank.

496 consists of two fragments from the same piece of cartonnage which included 458, the Deuteronomy papyrus, and 499 below. The hand is similar to that of the Homer papyrus, 539, of the same origin, and may be assigned to the later second century B.C. The use of ἄφθορος in l. 5 suggests that it may be part of a tragedy.

497 is written along the fibres in a heavy, square hand of the first century; is deep and broad, and angular with a horizontal cross-stroke. Apparently it contains, in part at least, iambic verses; Lobel suggests that it may have been an anthology. If so, the shorter lines may have been subject headings. There are no accents or punctuation; the verso is blank.
498, small as it is, is of some interest since it is an early example of the use of the papyrus codex for non-Christian literature. It is written in a neat and remarkably small hand (the height of an average letter is 2 mm.), clearly influenced by cursive scripts and with occasional ligatures; it is probably to be dated in the early third century. This hand bears a very close resemblance to that of P. Lit. Lond. 53, a third-century codex of Semonides of Amorgos (?), Iambi, also written in a very small and semi-cursive hand. Very probably the codex was in proportion to the writing, and was one of those pocket editions of the classics mentioned by Martial as suitable presents at the Saturnalia (see Kenyon, Books and Readers in Greece and Rome, pp. 92 sq.). The ink is a dark black, fading to grey where the scribe has mixed too much water with it; accents and breathings (and probably punctuation also) are by a second hand. Of the contents there is little to be said, except that they were clearly in iambic verse, and were part of a comedy (most probably New Comedy), not tragedy.

499 is the largest of the unidentified literary scraps recovered from mummy cartonnage together with 458. Part of two columns, written in a free, slightly sloping, second-century hand, survive; which appear (or col. i at any rate) to be in elegiac verse; below this are traces of four more lines which reach at least across the inter-columnar space, and are not certainly metrical. Fragment (b) is a small piece of the upper layer of the papyrus and probably belongs to col. ii. On the verso are traces of demotic writing.

500 is written along the fibres in rather a large sloping hand, for which cf. P. Oxy. 1787, 1788. Line 1—perhaps a title, or a line omitted and afterwards added in the margin—is by the same hand, but smaller. Both the presence of accents and perhaps I. 1 suggest that the contents were verse rather than prose. The verso is blank.

494. 5 x 4.4 cm.  Later second century.  PLATE 7.

\[ \eta \, \text{proth} \nu \text{ou} \, \gamma \epsilon, \]
\[ \Delta \eta \mu \eta \tau \nu \, \kappa \alpha i \, \varepsilon \sigma \iota \]
\[ \eta \, \kappa \rho \alpha \delta \iota \, \kappa a \beta \delta \iota \]
\[ \varepsilon \iota \, \lambda \theta \iota \sigma \iota \nu \, \{ \}

495. 2.9 x 5.8 cm.  Early second century.  PLATE 5.

\[ \{ \}
\[ \{ \}
\[ \tau \hat{\eta} \, \varepsilon x[i] \]
\[ \xi \pi \nu \, \nu \iota \mu \]
\[ \varepsilon \nu \, \tau i \]
\[ \nu \, \kappa a i \, \pi o \]
\[ \varphi \varepsilon \iota \mu \iota \nu \{ \]

a. Perhaps \( x[i] \lambda \).  

s
496. Frag. (a) 2.6 x 5.6 cm. Later second century B.C. Frag. (b)

| 5   | μέλος. [    |     |     |     |
| 4   | ηυστα. [    |     |     |     |
| 3   | λειλον    |     |     |     |
| 2   | χιμεντή    |     |     |     |
| 1   | μν. [      |     |     |     |

5. Instead of η, η might be read; no other letter seems likely. βροτοί is glossed by Hesychius as κρημν. καὶ τις κρημν.μην.

10. There is no trace of ink after uαρος, which may have been a title; if so, the preceding line is perhaps best explained as a pentameter to which l. 10 would be attached as the hexameter.

497. 5.6 x 10.6 cm. First century.

| 5   | μελος. [    |     |     |     |
| 4   | κιμεν πι    |     |     |     |
| 3   | ου γαρ . [  |     |     |     |
| 2   | ιαρος [     |     |     |     |
| 1   | βλεπον ιαρ πι |

9. Instead of δ, δ might be read; no other letter seems likely. Βροτοί is glossed by Hesychius as κρημν., καὶ τις κρημν.μην.

12. There is no trace of ink after ιαρος, which may have been a title; if so, the preceding line is perhaps best explained as a pentameter to which l. 10 would be attached as the hexameter.

498. 2 x 3.2 cm. Third century. PLATE 5.

Recto.

| 5   | ειρ. [      |     |     |     |
| 4   | ηναι τοδε ει. [    |     |     |     |
| 3   | ειδ. ετει. [    |     |     |     |
| 2   | λαθ. δ γαθη    |     |     |     |
| 1   | . ετ. [     |     |     |     |

Verso.

| 10  | καλουμεν   |     |     |     |
| 9   | ου νανος  ει|     |     |     |
| 8   | τοπος δε [  |     |     |     |
| 7   | . θη . ενι|     |     |     |

3. The last letters of this line are smudged and there may have been a correction; possibly ιαρι should be read.

5. Above the second letter of this line is an accent or apostrophe, which has either been smudged or, more probably, crossed out.
10. The κ does not come directly below the τ of τορός, and it is possible that another letter preceded it; but the fact that the κ is larger than other letters, with a long flourish reaching below the line, makes this unlikely.

11. This ejaculation, hardly possible in tragedy, is not infrequent in New Comedy: cf. the indices in Jensen's Menandri Reliquiae and Meineke's Comitiorum Graecorum Fragmenta.

499

7.8 x 9 cm. Later second century B.C.

Col. i.

Frang. (a).

Col. ii.

[... ]Σρ . [ ]

[ξ ϕ]

[σ Σ]

[αμβροσιασίσ]

5 ) νοτρεφεται

οὐρομ εχουσα

[λων]

[εραι Ελλας]

[... σοφαι]

10 ) άρθα

[ονον . . .]

[ολεμα και ανζοι]

[ουπτομει]

[η επιτ πτολ]

15 ) [η . []

12. The mark before the ο may be merely a linking stroke; if it is part of a letter, ο might be read: π cannot.

500.

2.1 x 6 cm. Third century.

[Λωδία]

[καν λιφ]

[. συς ψ]

[νι τολ]

5 [καν καφ]

[. ρησει []

[. δεμ]

1. Perhaps ανλωδία (Lobel).

7. Nothing remains of the letter below the diaeresis.
501–521. MISCELLANEOUS FRAGMENTS (PROSE).

This group includes all the small and unidentified fragments which are not obviously verse. Of these, 515 and 516 were in the same folder as 487 and so belong to the original purchase by Hunt; 509, 510, and 511 were acquired in 1920, the rest in 1917.

The first three were recovered from the same pieces of cartonnage which produced 458, 496, 499, and 539. They are written in different but similar hands, probably of the later second century B.C.; that of 502 is heavier than the others and has a slight slope to the right. The mention of Rome in 501—of some interest in a papyrus of this date—indicates that the text was historical and might suggest Polybius as the author; but I have been unable to identify this fragment with any passage in the extant works; fragment (a) appears to be in oratio recta. Short spaces have been left in l. 9 and 10, presumably to indicate the end of a sentence; between ll. 3 and 4 and again in l. 12 is a considerable gap, perhaps to mark the end of a section. Not enough survives of either 502 or 503 to give any clue to the contents.

504 is a narrative fragment, the vocabulary of which is so reminiscent of Thucydides, vi. 46 (the passage describing the trick played by the Segestaeans on the Athenian ambassadors in 416 B.C.), as to allow the conjecture that the same incident is the subject of 504. The relevant passage of Thucydides is quoted in the note. The same incident was also described by Diodorus, xii. 83, and Polyaenus, Strat. vi. 21, both of whom derive their account from Thucydides. The similarity between the vocabulary of this fragment and that of the passage in Thucydides may be no more than a coincidence; but it is possible that we have a scrap from some history of Sicily, perhaps from the Ἱερὰ Σικελία of Philistus, to whom both P. Oxy. 665 and the Florence papyrus published by G. Coppola have been ascribed.1 The hand is a very handsome uncial of the square, upright type (cf. Schubart, Pal., Abb. 93); v at the end of a line is represented by a line drawn over the preceding vowel; accents—rare in a prose text—are to be noted in ll. 8 and 12. If the reconstruction suggested in the note to l. 9 is correct, the number of letters to a line was between 12 and 15. The verso is blank.

505 is a fragment from the bottom of a page of a papyrus codex, written in a heavy, square hand not unlike that of P. Amh. 1. The ink is of the usual brown variety. A small ink mark in the left margin of the recto perhaps indicates that this is an inner, not an outer margin, i.e. that recto precedes verso. The lower margin measures 3.7 cm. The work to which it belongs was a metrical treatise; the surviving fragment seems to deal with the pyrrhic.

506 is written along the fibres in a slanting and somewhat faded third-century hand; on the verso are traces of an account. If μεταφορά is correctly read in l. 7, the fragment may belong to a work on rhetoric. A slight pause in l. 3 probably indicates the end of a sentence.

507 is a fragment from the bottom of a page of a papyrus codex, written in the elegant slanting hand that was the precursor of the more formal Byzantine type. It has some resemblance to Schubart, Pal., Abb. 98, but is considerably freer; small finials may be

1 See G. Coppola in Rivista di Filologia, 58 (1930), pp. 449 sq.
noticed on some letters, in particular τ and υ; ε is angular and large, while β is pinched and reaches above and below the line. If the Eusebius of i. 9 is one of the ecclesiastical writers of that name, the fragment may belong to a Christian apologetic work which attacked the pagan mythology; but he may be one of the late rhetoricians of that name, see RE, vi. 1445, nos. 35-8.

Another fragment from a papyrus codex, of rather later date, is 508, written in a bold, slanting hand in reddish brown ink. It obviously belongs to a prose work, but there is nothing to give a clue to its nature.

To judge from the vocabulary, 509 should be part of an oratorical work, but I have been unable to attach it to any extant speech. It is written along the fibres in a small, rounded, and rather heavy hand; on the verso are traces, badly rubbed, of a document.

The recto of 510 is occupied with what is most probably a philosophical text written in a rounded, rather broad, book-hand; the subject seems to be a discussion of τα διανο and τα μερη, such as is extant in Plato, Theaetetus, 204 sq. More puzzling is the text on the verso, written in a slanting, cursive hand and full of abbreviations (for which see notes: some appear to be new). The only clue to its identity lies in the names Ἀρτυλυς and Σελευς ( ), although in neither case is the reading quite certain; if they are correct, the fragment probably belongs to a historical or chronological work on the Seleucid kingdom.

Both 511 and 512 also may have belonged to philosophical works. The former is written in a small book-hand of the second century A.D., and has traces of writing on the verso; the latter is written on the verso across the fibres in a small, neat hand of much the same period; the recto is blank. The spaces after lines 3 and 10 are probably due to the scribe's having started each section on a new line.

513 is written along the fibres on rather coarse papyrus, several layers thick, in a small, crabbed hand of the second, or perhaps the late first, century A.D. The surface is abraded in parts and the ink smudged. At the bottom, in the space after l. xi, the papyrus has been pierced with a small hole. On the verso has been written in large, upright letters ἡ οἰκον.

514 contains part of two columns written along the fibres in a hand which is probably an early example of the so-called 'Biblical' type (cf. the Hawara Homer in Kenyon's Palaeography of Greek Papyri, Plate XX, which it closely resembles). A paragraphus has been placed below l. xx and a line-filler in l. i. The verso is blank.

515 is a small cartonnage fragment, written along the fibres in a hand similar to that of P. Grenf. II. vii (b), or to that of P. Hib. 20. The letters are long and narrow, with a slight slope; the ink is deep black. Another small fragment of the same is too rubbed for any letters to be identified. Possibly this scrap belonged not to a prose work but to e.g. a comedy.

Another piece of early Ptolemaic cartonnage is 517, written in a smaller and more cursive hand than 516. Both these were found, together with 487, among the Byzantine documents which formed part of the original collection, and were presumably overlooked by mistake when Volume I was in preparation. Hence it is not unlikely that, like 16a and perhaps 39, they originally came from Hibeh.

517 is remarkable as being a fragment of an opisthograph roll; both the hand on the recto and that on the verso are unmistakably book-hands, the former being upright and
medium-sized (the φ with an unusually long upright stroke and a broad, pinched bow is noticeable), that on the verso small, neat, and slanting. On the recto at right angles to the text another hand has added Δωρε, which may have some reference to the text on the verso. The text on the recto may be attributed to the second half of the second century, that on the verso to the end of the same or the beginning of the next century.

518 is a fragment from the bottom of a column, written along the fibres in an upright hand of the early second century (cf. Schubart, Pal., Abb. 35). The margin is 7 cm. in depth (for a still deeper margin, see P. Ryl. 16); the verso is blank.

519 is a scrap from the top of a column, 520 from the top of a leaf of a papyrus codex; the former is written in a small, neat hand of the second century, the latter in a broad, sloping hand, certainly not earlier than the fifth century.

521 consists of two exiguous scraps, written across the fibres in a small, heavy and slightly slanting hand, probably of the second half of the second century; they might just as well belong to a verse as to a prose work. On the verso are traces of a document.

501. Frag. (a) 4 × 9 cm. Later second century B.C.

Frag. (b).

10. The ρ in this line seems unavoidable, as traces of a long stroke below the line can be seen; neither καὶ οὖν nor Καρος can be read. Καρος might be either the genitive of Καρ or the Latin name Carus.

14. Before the χ is a middle point, preceded by a small gap. There may have been two letters between the χ and the ρ.

502. Later second century B.C.

3:5 × 7 cm.
503. 2.7 x 4.7 cm. Later second century B.C.

5 kev to[e]l
θηνιαί
χρονοι
δε προ[ι]

504. 5 x 11.3 cm. Second to third century.

Plate 5.

6 evdýamones
τοῖον
πούλλαι' δε χρυ

10 ς δε εκτω

5 ἔττονες
μην αγαλ

5 κατασκευ

? διαγραμμασ(ν)

1 sq. The most relevant sentence in Thucydides, vi. 46 runs as follows: ἐστὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ Ἐρωτείω τῆς Ἀφρι- δήτης ἀγαθῆς· ἐπεξεὶς ἐπεξείς τὰ ἀνθρώπων, φιλῶν τε καὶ φιλοτοιχίας καὶ θημιστορία καὶ ἄλλων κατασκευῆς, οὐκ ἄλλην ἄλλων ἀργία διότι πλούτω τῶν ὧν ἐπ' ἀλάμβανεν διαμόρφων καὶ ἄλλων παρείχοντο· καὶ ἂν ὑπὸ τῶν παραylon τῶν τοῦτον ἐξ αὐτός ἢ ἔριστη ἅπαται καὶ ἁρμᾶ καὶ ἀργία διαλέξεις· καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῶν ἑγών πόλεων καὶ Φωνικῶν καὶ Ἴλλην ἄλλων αὐτηγόμενοι ἐσέφερον ὡς τὰς ἑπτάδες καὶ ἄλλες ἑκάσται.

9. The following reconstruction of this and the following lines may be offered: πολλοῖς δὲ χρυσοῖ τε καὶ ἀργίαν πολλοῖς ἐκκισμῶν καὶ μην αγαλμάσων. If διαγραφήσων in l. 13 is correct (for the meaning schedule, list, cf. Demosthenes, xiv. 31 and xlvii. 36) it may have stood in a parenthesis.

505. 12.3 x 9.6 cm. Fifth to sixth century.
1. Probably some form of βραχός, or of its compounds τρίβραχος and ἄμφιβραχος is to be recognized here, as also in ll. 5 and 8.

9. For the use of ἁγμός as the equivalent of πυρρίχος cf. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Comp. 15 and Dem. 47, Hephaestion (Teubner ed.) 213, 3 and 299, 8.

506. 4-8 x 6-8 cm. Third century.

507. 3-5 x 4-8 cm. Fourth century.

508. 4-4 x 5-2 cm. Fifth century.

3. In view of l. 1, ἀγωνεῖν as δέ [, is a less likely division.
4. Perhaps the proper name, Thoipilios.

509. 3.9 x 5 cm. Second century.

1. ρa
   λο
   υψηθυνος
   εψαγει

5 λαιοδορει
   ρσ χαιρω
   [ ... ]
   [ ... ]
   εγκρωμαις]

510. 6.3 x 7.9 cm. Second to third century.

Recto.

5 κενοις τας τα μερη
   ιρο ολον αναγηκ η ταρ[...]
   κοστουκεντροθ[...]
   στουις λρς.[...]
   γηα και γρ
   ερωθ ρ
   τωρει
   [ ... ]

10 σπλ(υ) δι ου ακ[ ... ] ση(υ)λεγωμ( ... )
   φοβισ γης . α( ... ) γινωμ( ... )
   ουρανου δημιουρ(υ) κοκι

Verso.

[ ... ]
   [ ... ]
   [ ... ]
   [ ... ]
   [ ... ]
   [ ... ]
   [ ... ]
   [ ... ]
   [ ... ]
   [ ... ]
   [ ... ]

1. Line 2 is quite clearly the first line of the column and consequently it is difficult to interpret the .δ as other than numeration. For the numeration of columns there is little or no evidence, cf. Schubart, Das Buch, p. 137; the letter before δ resembles an ε (thus, if the letters are numerals, giving a surprisingly high figure), but an μ is not impossible.
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4. Above the second τ of τουτων are clear traces of ink; these look most like a τ, but perhaps are intended as a critical sign, I (cf. I. in the Antinoë Juvenal, Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, xx (1935), p. 202).

5. Perhaps ήν ουτας, from ολοτρως = tolerable, but this does not seem probable.

7. The division of this line is difficult. The double ω may be due to dittography; if so, we might read ἱος τ' ους επισοδίους.

Verso.

2. ἤν τρ P. The former abbreviation is perhaps for ἀραςκενοι: for the symbol cf. BKT. I, p. 2, and BKT. IV, pp. 2 sq.; for the latter see note to l. 6.

3. ἤν τρ P. The stroke of abbreviation is more slanting than that after ν in l. 2: perhaps τοις δ(ε). If the following word is a proper name, either Καλλοχαριος or Καλλιάς might be read; but neither seems very suitable in this context.

4. δικής ης P. The former is probably for δικής: for the symbol cf. BKT. IV, p. 2; ε' normally = ενι but in l. 8 this is not abbreviated.

5. οῆλθαν cannot be read here; instead of the first ν, ρ might be read, while the letter preceding the λ is probably ο or ω. ν' P; probably δ(ε) or δ(τρών), more probably the former. Προληφαίνω might be read.

6. τρ P. This abbreviation appears to be new: δια is commonly abbreviated δ.

7. σελενετός P.

8. ἦν οὐς P; perhaps for some form of άτρόχη: δ(ε) might be read for α, but is less likely. η: σελενετός P. The usual symbol for οὖς is σ'.

9. τρ P. The latter is the regular abbreviation for τη. For the name Απαχα, see Pape, Namenbuch, s.v.; one bearer of this name was the wife of Seleucus Nicator. ορασα: ? for ερασαθαι.

10. αφ P. The abbreviation after άρα παρατατικας as after ταῦτα in the next line is the same as that after ὁρασαθαι in l. 9, i.e. 5; but here it seems more likely to stand for the participial than for the infinitival termination.

11. ακ P. The next letter resembles ι, but what looks like ink may only be a stain.

12. ημιθευος(α): perhaps for ημιθευον, but the reading is doubtful. At the end of the line, presumably κοκυνιος, or some part or derivative of it, should be read.

511. Second century.

3.2 × 5.6 cm.

perseus τον ερωτομαι[ενων]
   επετετετεθαι []
   η: [·] του []
   . . ρα παρατατικας []
   μεταλαξ[.]
   θε[.]
   . . οικ[.] την την []
   . . ην[.]
   . . η[.]

512. Second century.

3.6 × 5.4 cm. PLATE 6.

αρω
ητα αλ
μετε βευ
[.]
[. . .
5]
. . .
. . .
513.  2.7 x 8 cm.  ? Second century.

|αμαλυ . . |
|κατα οδε γι|
|λιματα σου|
|τε σεξαοι|
|το . . . . |
|υπερ στη, |
|υπης δε πατρι|

514.  7 x 7 cm.  Second century.  PLATE 7.

Col. i.

|η μακα . . |
|γηματο|
|κεν σα|
|σω σοφ|
|πρα|
|ου|

Col. ii.

|οτι κ . |
|τας πι|
|ποι|
|νετον |
|και σπι|
|ραν ν . |
|λοιπ|
|της φι|
|ου φι|

515.  2.6 x 2.4 cm.  Third century B.C.  PLATE 5.

|μαλαθ|
|θεου εδοξε πι|
|γλυκυ τι παι|
|παι τα αη . |
|ει [, .] το |

516.  2 x 2.2 cm.  Third century B.C.

|γα 
|σ προς τε ναι|
|φ . υπηγγ . |

2. Οτ προγεναιτεν ...]
517.  

Recto.  

2-6 x 3-5 cm.  

Second century.  

Verso.  

ματι
διδω
λογο
συν
και ετ
φαντ
[αν]

518.  

3-2 x 8-1 cm.  

Early second century.  

Ἰοντες ὑ
ἐν δ ὦν ματι

519.  

2-3 x 3-2 cm.  

Second century.  

ἤγγον ετ
τοι
και τοι

520.  

3 x 5-7 cm.  

Fifth to sixth century.  

Recto.  

Ἰσον δισερχ

Verso.  

ἰσοραιον α
521.  \[ \begin{array}{ll}
\text{(a)} & \text{(b)} \\
501-521. \text{ MISCELLANEOUS FRAGMENTS (PROSE)} \\
\text{Frag. (a) 1.3} \times 2 \text{ cm.} & \text{Late second century.} \\
\nu \phi \iota & \pi \alpha \sigma \theta \iota \iota \sigma \\
\mu & \tau \upsilon \alpha \\
\tau & \varepsilon \iota \iota \\
5 & 9 \\
\end{array} \]

8. \( ? \; \alpha \gamma \varepsilon \iota \omega \nu \).
IV. SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL TEXTS

522. PTOLEMY, "Επιστήμων Πόλεων Κανών.1

Acquired in 1917. Fayûm. 11.3 x 11.7 cm. Third century. PLATE 4.

This papyrus, on the recto of which are the astronomical tables (no. 523), contains on the verso a select list of cities (in the extant portion are included those of Spain, Gaul, the Danubian provinces and Italy), accompanied in each case by a statement of their respective longitude and latitude. As Honigmann (op. cit., p. 62) has shown, the term επιστήμων πόλεων may well be older than Ptolemy and may have denoted even before his time a fixed list of cities; it is, however, particularly associated with the Επιστήμων Πόλεων Κανών which formed the πρώτον κανώνον of Ptolemy's Πρόξεροι Κανών and was designed to serve as a Hifßmittel (Honigmann, p. 70) to the astronomical tables. (It may be noted that the tables on the recto of this papyrus are certainly Ptolemaic in origin; see introd. to 523.) This list has often been regarded as a late and spurious by-product of the Geography (so apparently O. Cuntz, Die Geographie des Ptolemaeus (Berlin, 1923), pp. 37-8) and is not printed by Heiberg in his text of the Πρόξεροι Κανών; while W. Kubitschek Die Kalenderbücher, Denkschr. Kais. Akad. Wien, lvii (1915), 3, pp. 76-7, who thinks it of some value for the text of Ptolemy, regards it merely as an excerpt from Bk. VIII of the Geography and considers that the measurements by latitude and longitude (the form in which they appear in the papyrus) were first inserted in the Κανών by an editor of the late fourth-century astronomer Theon—a view which is refuted by the existence of this papyrus. In Bk. VIII of the Geography Ptolemy gives a select list of geographical names to accompany the maps to his Geography in which the positions are given, not by degrees of longitude and latitude, but by the difference in time calculated from the meridian of Alexandria and by the number of hours on the longest day. Although Ptolemy explicitly says (Opera Astronomica Minora, ed. Heiberg, p. 159) περιέχοντο δὲ οἱ μὲν πρώτοι κανώνες τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς ὁλοκληρίας ἐπιστημοτέρων πόλεων τὰς κατὰ μῆνας καὶ πλάσμα ἔπογκα, this list in Bk. VIII has often been regarded as the source of the Κανών. Against this view Honigmann (p. 71) is of opinion that Ptolemy published the Κανών because the method employed in Bk. VIII was so clumsy as to render it too difficult to use; both he and Schnabel, who (p. 242) regards Bk. VIII as an earlier work than the Κανών, are of opinion that the Κανών in its original form contained only the names listed in Bk. VIII.2

1 The principal works which I have used in editing this text are as follows: E. Honigmann, Die Sieben Klimata und die Πόλεων 'Επιστήμων (Heidelberg, 1929); J. Fischer, Claudii Ptolemaei Geographiae Codex Urbianus Graecus 8o, Tomus Prodomus (Leiden/Leipzig, 1932); P. Schnabel, Die Entstehungsgeschichte des kartographischen Erdbildes des Claudius Ptolemaios, S. B. Preuss. Akad. 1930, pp. 214-50. I wish also to thank Dr. J. G. Smyly, who saw a copy of the text at an early stage and made some valuable suggestions.

2 On the question whether these texts were part of a codex or of an opisthograph roll see introduction to 523, p. 153.

3 Schnabel thinks that Bk. VIII originally gave the degrees of longitude and latitude, and that the Κανών is an 'Auszug aus
Recently the authenticity and independence of the *Kavwv* have been convincingly defended by J. Fischer who points out (pp. 91 sq.) that the measurements given in the tables do not agree completely either with those of Bk. VIII or with those of Bks. II–VII, though they are closer to the latter; and further, that neither the order nor the number of the cities corresponds to that of Bk. VIII. It may be added that the headings attached to the various sections of Bk. VIII are not found in any of the MSS. of the *Kavwv*. It is of course easy to argue, as does Kubitschek (*op. cit.*, pp. 77-9) that every name in the *Kavwv* not found in Bk. VIII is an interpolation, and further, that of two ninth-century MSS., one is preferable to the other because it does not include the two Italian towns Pisa and Praeneste; yet both these towns are recorded, though not in quite the same position, in the third-century papyrus. It is at the least remarkable that a papyrus of this date, earlier than the recensions of Pappus and Theon, should contain the same ‘interpolations’ as the ninth-century Leidensis LXXVIII. Even Honigmann is of opinion that the *Kavwv* included only those cities listed in Bk. VIII, although, as the two lists were published for different purposes, there is no reason why they should correspond. The papyrus may be held to support Fischer’s view: ‘An sich . . . spricht die Vermehrung der Städte und die Positionssänderung derselben nicht gegen ptolemäischen Ursprung’ (p. 101), and his conclusions that ‘der Stättekanon der Astronomischen Handtafeln eine bedeutend vermehrte neue und verbesserte Ausgabe der ausgezeichneten Städte der Geographie zu bieten scheint’ (p. 99), and may be later not only than Bk. VIII, but than Bks. II–VII as well.

The best description of the MSS. of the *Kavwv* is to be found in Schnabel (pp. 221 sq.). Of these the four most important date from the ninth century, and of these four, two, Vaticanus Graccus 1291 (V) and Leidensis LXXVIII (L), have been made accessible by Honigmann (Appendix, pp. 193-231). Of these two V, although it has suffered considerably from displacement of the leaves, is commonly regarded as the more reliable text, and there is reason for thinking (Honigmann, pp. 73, 78) that this MS. represents the recension of Pappus (late third century). L, on the other hand, so Honigmann thinks (p. 75), may stand in the same relation to the work of Theon (late fourth century). L contains a greater number of cities not listed in Bk. VIII than V, and hence Kubitschek is of opinion that L has suffered more from interpolation than V. Schnabel points out (p. 224) that L has 50 per cent. more names than V; among the ‘interpolations’ common to all four MSS., each of which represents a different recension, he mentions Ἀρείλαρως which in all probability is also found in the papyrus (l. 16). The text of the papyrus (which can be regarded as prior to the work of both Pappus and Theon) is not identical with the text of either V or L; but its divergencies from the latter are few. It differs from L only in omitting Epidaurus (in Illyria), in including Emona (found in V, not in L) and Aricia (though no measurements are given for this in the papyrus; see note to line 36) and in placing Praeneste and Pisa immediately before Rome instead of immediately after Nicaea. In view of the number of interpolations which have been attributed to L, the degree of agreement between the two texts is remarkable; it must, however, be remembered that only fifty lines of the papyrus are extant. Its disagreements with V (in its present form)

Buch VIII*, and precedes Bk. II–VII of the Geography. It appears that this cannot be established (Fischer, p. 533) until a critical text of the *Kavwv* has been published.
both in the number and order of the cities are more numerous; but it may be noticed that occasionally (e.g. I. 12 and 32) its measurements agree with those of V against L and the Geography.¹ In view of Fischer's theory that the Kañoú represents a revision by Ptolemy of his earlier work, it is interesting to find that on occasion (e.g. I. 31 Salonae and I. 8 Augustodunum) it agrees with V and L against G; in other places (e.g. I. 17 Vienna) the other MSS. of the Kañoú may have been influenced by G; in other places (e.g. I. 17 Vienna) it disagrees with all three.

The papyrus is written in a rounded hand, handsome and easy, which is probably not later than the middle of the third century and may well be earlier. Down the edge of each column is drawn a double line in red ink and there are traces of a similar line along the bottom margin. A single vertical line (also in red ink) separates the names of the cities from the longitudes and another the latter from the latitudes, while horizontal lines divide up the cities into sections of two or occasionally three names. The first letter of the names of provinces or countries projects into the narrow margin between the two columns: against Rome has been set a cross with a stroke through the middle of it in red ink and a small circle in black ink—the only city to be honoured with a 'double star'. This format is of some interest, as it seems to have persisted in MSS. of the Kañoú; at least, in two of the MSS. described by Fischer (pp. 93-5: Vat. Gr. 1291 and Vat. Gr. 208) the tables are surrounded by a double line drawn in red ink and are divided into fifteen sections (in a complete column of the papyrus there would have been more) by cross-lines, also in red ink. The orthography, though not perfect, is better than might be expected of an Egyptian scribe harassed by foreign names, and compares favourably with that of L. This is the first text of Ptolemy to be found in his native Egypt; although another Rylands papyrus (I. 27: see introd.), which is probably based on his work, bears the title 'Τοπογραφία Πτολεμαίου. This text, as well as 524 and 526, was said to have come from the Fayûm.

The text has been collated with the texts of V and L as given by Honigmann, and with Müller's edition of the G(eography), Bks. II-III.

¹ Bks. II-III (ed. Müller, 1883): henceforth referred to as G.
² As a glance at the text will show, all the names in col. 1 of the papyrus have been restored from the measurements, and consequently cannot be regarded as certain.
522. PTOLEMY, Ἐπιστήμων Πόλεων Κανῶν

Col. i. | Col. ii.
---|---
|...
|...
|...
|...
|...

| Κλουνία | μβ |
| Καυσαρεία Ανυσιστα | ιδL |
| Παρακάκων | μεL |
| Ακουστανός | μεL |
| Μεσολακόνιον | μεL |
| Βοιρίναλα | μεL |
| Λαυδενησίας | μεL |
| Αἐγοντόθουνον | μεL |
| Λαυδονονον | μεL |
| Βέλλυση | μεL |
| Γιγορικανον | μεL |
| Δαυροκοτορόν | μεL |
| Ναρβανησίας | μεL |
| Μασσαλία | μεL |
| Ναρβον | μεL |
| Αρελανον | μεL |
| Ουενον | μεL |
| Νεμανον | μεL |
| Γερμανίας | μεL |

1. In L, 30 names, either of cities, provinces, or countries, appear before Κλουνία; of these, Παρακάκων (spelled Καρπακάκων), which comes in l. 3 of the papyrus, is one, so that we can calculate that some 29 lines are missing from col. i of the papyrus, i.e. the column had c. 48 lines. Between Γερμανίας (l. 19), however, and Παρακάκων ης ανω there are only 15 names in L, which would give us only 45 lines in col. ii. The table would have begun with the British Isles, and it should be noted that five of the names which appear in L are not given in the corresponding list in the Geography, Bk. VIII (3-11); hence it is more likely that the papyrus omitted in col. i three of the names which appear in L than that it added in col. ii to the cities listed in L as situated in Germany or the Alpine provinces. The column, then, more probably contained 45 than 48 lines.
3. The parallel of Macedon is given in G and L as μ'/γ'' in V as μ'/γ'. In L it appears immediately before Κανονία; in V its position is the same as in the papyrus.

4-5. Neither the heading Ακουστέρας nor the form Μεθυλάμνων are listed in L; both appear in V, but in this MS. the cities of the Danube lands are inserted between those of Spain and Gaul. In the general order the papyrus agrees with L. In G and V the parallel of Μεθυλάμνων is given μ'/λ''γ''.

6. μ'/λ'', so G and L: μ'/λ'' V.

7. In L the position of the province is given as ν'/μ'/θ''; in V, as in the papyrus and elsewhere in L, in the case of provinces, the measurements are omitted. Possibly the figures in L are due to dittography.

8. Here the papyrus agrees with L and V; in G the measurements are κ'/θ'' and μ'/λ''.

9. Or Καλλικράτης, as in L.

10. The parallel of Gesoricum appears as ν'/λ'' in G and L; none is given in V.

11. The parallel of Salona appears as ν'/λ'' in G and L; none is given in V.

12. κ'/λ'' in G and L: κ'/θ', with the papyrus, V.

13. G and L give the meridian of Marseilles as κ'/λ'', V as κ'/θ'; the κ'/θ'' of the papyrus is probably due to manuscript corruption. Thirteen of the MSS. of the Geography cited by Müller read κ'/θ'' for κ'/λ''.

14. κ'/λ'' G, V, and L.

15. μ'/G, V, and L. According to Strabo (see Müller's note, p. 342), the measurement would be μ'/γ'/θ'', which is more accurate than Ptolemy's measurement in the Geography. The papyrus here, as elsewhere, may represent a later correction by Ptolemy.

16. μ'/λ'' G, V, and L.

17. According to Strabo (see Müller's note, p. 342), the measurement would be μ'/γ'/θ'', which is more accurate than Ptolemy's measurement in the Geography. The papyrus here, as elsewhere, may represent a later correction by Ptolemy.

18. μ'/λ'', so G and L: μ'/λ'' V.

19. Read Σιάρδανα VIP. in V (l. 30), but is omitted in L. After Emona, Καραονία (l. 30) is given in V; this is absent from L as well as from the papyrus.

20. Read Σιάρδανα VIP. in V (l. 30), but is omitted in L. After Emona, Καραονία (l. 30) is given in V; this is absent from L as well as from the papyrus.

21. The meridian of Sirmium is given as μ'/λ''γ'' in G and V, as μ'/λ''θ'' in L (also in a Paris MS. of G).

22. So G and V: L reads μ'/θ'' and μ'/θ''.

23. So G and V: L reads μ'/θ'' and μ'/θ''.

24. Emona is listed in V (l. 30), but is omitted in L. After Emona, Καραονία (l. 30) is given in V; this is absent from L as well as from the papyrus.

25. Read Σιάρδανα VIP. in V (l. 30), but is omitted in L. After Emona, Καραονία (l. 30) is given in V; this is absent from L as well as from the papyrus.

26. Read Σιάρδανα VIP. in V (l. 30), but is omitted in L. After Emona, Καραονία (l. 30) is given in V; this is absent from L as well as from the papyrus.

27. Read Σιάρδανα VIP. in V (l. 30), but is omitted in L. After Emona, Καραονία (l. 30) is given in V; this is absent from L as well as from the papyrus.

28. The meridian of Sirmium is given as μ'/λ''γ'' in G and V, as μ'/λ''θ'' in L (also in a Paris MS. of G).

29. In G the meridian of Salonae appears as μ'/θ'' in G and L; none is given in V.

30. In G the meridian of Salonae appears as μ'/θ'' in G and L; none is given in V.

31. In G the meridian of Salonae appears as μ'/θ'' in G and L; none is given in V.

32. In G the meridian of Salonae appears as μ'/θ'' in G and L; none is given in V.

33. In G the meridian of Salonae appears as μ'/θ'' in G and L; none is given in V.

34. In G the meridian of Salonae appears as μ'/θ'' in G and L; none is given in V.

35. In G the meridian of Salonae appears as μ'/θ'' in G and L; none is given in V.

36. It is not easy to explain how the corruption in this line has arisen; the writer has no doubt confused Νικαια (Νικαια Μακεδόνων) with Nicotera in S. Italy, and the meridian given is that of Nicotera. The strange thing is that Nicotera does not even appear in Geography, Bk. III, let alone in Bk. VIII or in the Kaνών. More surprising is the addition of Aricia in Latium, which has no connexion either with Nicaea or Nicotera; this town again, though it is listed in Geography, Bk. III, does not appear in Bk. VIII or in the Kaνών.

37. Immediately after Nicaea, L places Πειραιάς and Πραιαντερων (Πραιαντερων MS.), in that order; in the papyrus they appear in the reversed order after Aquileia. They are omitted in V. For the different position assigned to them in other MSS. see Fischer, op. cit., p. 101. Kubitschek (Denkschr. Wien. Akad., 57 (1915), p. 78), regards it as a proof of the superiority of V that these two towns have not been inserted; but if they are an unauthorized addition to the text of Ptolemy the insertion must have been made very early, as their presence in the papyrus shows.

38. Read Ταρακούνας. So V: λ'/ζ''θ'' L and G (though one MS., Ν, reads λ'/ζ''').

39. The position of Rome in the papyrus is that assigned to it in L, except that Praenestum and Pisa appear after Nicaea in L (see note to l. 36). V also places it after Aquileia; but then (perhaps owing to a tear in the MS., see Fischer, op. cit., p. 101) goes on to Dacia.

40. Read Βουενεστίας.

41. L reads Κυριονολέρος, all in one line. It is more likely that in the papyrus Aleria appeared as a separate line.
523. ASTRONOMICAL TABLE.

Acquired in 1917.  

The identity of this papyrus was discovered by the late Dr. Fotheringham, to whom I am greatly indebted for the substance of the following introduction. The extant text is part of a table of oblique ascensions (the intervals by which any point in the sky rises later than the first point of Aries, i.e. the spring equinoctial point) for each degree of the ecliptic and for each of a series of zones (κλίματα); the present fragment extends from the 12th to the 30th degree of Pisces and gives the ascension in degrees and minutes for the fourth, fifth, and sixth zones—Rhodes (Lat. 36° 0'), Hellespont (Lat. 40° 56'), and Mid Pontus (Lat. 45° 1'). A similar list for every 10° of the ecliptic is given by Ptolemy in the second book of the Almagest (ed. Heiberg, vol. i, pp. 134-9) with the heading Κανόνων τῶν κατὰ δεκαμορφίαν ἀναφορῶν; and the values for each tenth degree in the papyrus coincide with those given in the Almagest. But in the Πρόχειροι Κανόνες of Ptolemy a fuller table, extending to each degree of the ecliptic, was given; and the first question raised by the papyrus (of importance also for the text on the verso, 522) is whether it can claim to give us the true text of the Πρόξειροι Κανονες. The only published text of these tables, based on a late and none too reliable MS., is that of the Abbé Halma in his Tables Manuelles de Ptolemée et de Théon, II. i sqq. (Paris 1823); in the printed text the tables are arranged according to κλίματα, i.e. the oblique ascensions for all twelve signs of the zodiac are given first for κλίμα πρῶτον then for κλίμα δεύτερον and so on. In the papyrus the arrangement is reversed; the oblique ascensions for Pisces alone were clearly given for all seven zones, and we may suppose that this table was preceded by similar tables for the other signs. A further difference is that in Halma’s text, side by side with the oblique ascensions (ἀναφοράι), the ὁραῖος χρόνος (the number of equinoctial hours in the longest day) are added in parallel columns for each κλίμα at each sign of the Zodiac. It is quite clear that the papyrus did not contain this table.

This in itself is not conclusive; not only is it possible that the arrangement in Halma’s text is substantially the work, not of Ptolemy, but of his fourth-century commentator Theon, but a similar rearrangement may have been made by a scribe (Dr. Fotheringham pointed out to me that the same is true of the MSS. of Jerome’s Chronica). Of more importance are the differences in the figures; of these Dr. Fotheringham wrote: ‘These are not accidental, but systematic, and imply a difference in the methods of interpolation adopted. I notice that the values for each tenth degree accord with those given in the Almagest. I presume that neither Ptolemy nor his successors made a separate computation for each degree, but found the values for intermediate degrees by interpolation. In the figures which you quote from Halma (op. cit., p. 48) it is clear that the figures for Pisces 23°, 24° [in the sixth zone, Mid Pontus] respectively, viz. 356° 26', 356° 26', are copyists’ errors or misprints for 356° 25', 356° 56'. With these corrections the difference of 5° 8' given by Ptolemy in the Almagest between the values for Pisces 20° and Pisces 30° for Mid Pontus [the sixth

1 For the MSS. of the Πρόχειροι Κανόνες see Heiberg’s Prolegomena to Ptolemy’s Opera Astronomica Minora (Teubner). None of the early MSS. are as yet accessible in printed form.
zone] is divided in Halma's text into eight intervals of 31', followed by two intervals of 30', the two short intervals occupying the two last places. The exact intervals on the papyrus are not so clear because the last figure is sometimes lost or illegible. Happily the figures are complete for the Hellespont (col. ii of the papyrus) from Pisces 12° to Pisces 30°. For Pisces 10° Ptolemy gives in the Almagest for the Hellespont 348° 33' and for the differences for the following 10°, 5° 47', and for the last ten degrees of Pisces 5° 40'. This should give a mean interval of 34·7' for each degree from 20° to 30°. Work with these two mean intervals and you get exactly the figures of the papyrus in this column. I take it, then, that this is the computer's rule of interpolation. The rule holds good, without any difficulties for col. iii of the papyrus, the zone of Mid Pontus, but does not work out quite so well for col. i, the zone of Rhodes. To quote Dr. Fotheringham again: 'The computer had 381' to divide between Pisces 10° and Pisces 20°. On this rule he should have had nine intervals of 38', followed by one of 39'. But it is clear that one of the first four intervals has been selected for 39'. Between Pisces 20° and Pisces 30°, Pisces 24° is lost on the papyrus. Of the other eight, seven values agree with this rule; but for Pisces 29° the rule gives a TWI K{3 while the papyrus gives clearly a TVI KY. Here we may suspect an error of the scribe, if not of the scholar.

That the table given by the papyrus is at least based on Ptolemy may legitimately be deduced from its agreement with the Almagest in the readings for Pisces 20° and 30°; but whether the quantities shown on the papyrus are copied from the Προχερος Κανόνες or independently interpolated from the Almagest is a question that can hardly be answered with the evidence at our disposal. The balance of evidence is, perhaps, against the view that the table, in the shape in which it appears on the papyrus, formed part of the text of the Προχερος Κανόνες; against that may be set the fact that the papyrus is early in date, that rearrangement and disorder particularly in late MSS. are by no means unknown, and that the text on the verso of these tables belongs, almost certainly, to the Προχερος Κανόνες. It is to be hoped that further evidence will soon be forthcoming from some of the unpublished MSS.

The papyrus is written along the fibres, almost certainly in the same hand which was responsible for the list of 'Επίσημοι Πόλεις on the verso: the writing, however, is less compressed and the figures larger. We may suppose that this table was preceded by similar tables for the other eleven signs of the Zodiac, and was itself the last. In that case, one other column, after col. iii, would be required for the seventh zone, that of the Borysthenes, and the same amount of space would suffice, on the verso, for the names of the cities in the first column of the 'Επισημοι Πόλεων Κανών. Hence our fragment might come from the end of a roll; that the writing on the verso begins at what is the end of the recto might suggest that the reader was meant to turn direct from recto to verso. It is, however, possible that the papyrus is not a fragment of an opisthograph roll, but of a leaf of a codex; in favour of this it may be noted that the list of the degrees 1-30 stands immediately

1 In the copy of the text seen by Dr. Fotheringham, I had read ΤΙΔ Α(, for Pisces 23°, which would involve a further discrepancy: the reading required by the rule ΤΙΔ Α( and suggested by Dr. Fotheringham was confirmed by a re-examination of the papyrus.

2 The number of Ελιγματε was generally accepted as seven: in Halma's text, an eighth, that of Byzantium, is added: in general see E. Honigmann, Die Sieben Klimata und die Πόλεων 'Επίσημοι, pp. 7 sq.
before col. i, but not before the other two columns, and this although col. i on the papyrus is col. iv of the text, as the measurements for the first three zones must have preceded it; this suggests that the left side of the papyrus was the left side of a page, and the degrees of the ecliptic were repeated on each page. Further the table of oblique ascensions would come to an end after one more column (Pisces being the last of the signs of the Zodiac), and it is possible that this Ἐστίν was directly succeeded by the Ἐποιήμων Πόλεων Ἐστίν; and the part of that text preserved on the verso of the papyrus is certainly from the beginning of the Ἐστίν. Against this view should be set the fact that the writing, though probably in the same hand, differs in size, and that the end of the column of writing comes lower down the page on the verso than on the recto. The form of the recto is similar to that of the verso; columns are separated by double lines in red ink, while divisions within the column are marked by single lines. The sign for zero, \( \tau \rho \varsigma \) is interesting; Dr. Smyly suggests that the long line is an ornamental expansion of the \( \nu \) in \( \delta = \vartheta \nu \delta \nu \).\(^1\)

After the text and transcription I have added a table showing the measurements in Halma's text for the degrees corresponding to the extant portion of our text; the columns, of course, do not appear in this order in Halma, and I have omitted the ἤριαν χρόνον.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col. i.</th>
<th>Col. ii.</th>
<th>Col. iii.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>κλίμα τεταρτον</td>
<td>κλίμα πεμπτον</td>
<td>κλίμα εκτον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ &amp; θ</td>
<td>τμ &amp; θ</td>
<td>τν &amp; θ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \eta )</td>
<td>( \tau \nu \beta )</td>
<td>( \tau \nu \beta )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \lambda )</td>
<td>( \tau \nu \theta )</td>
<td>( \tau \nu \theta )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \kappa )</td>
<td>( \tau \nu \gamma )</td>
<td>( \tau \nu \gamma )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \kappa )</td>
<td>( \tau \nu \delta )</td>
<td>( \tau \nu \delta )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \kappa )</td>
<td>( \tau \nu \epsilon )</td>
<td>( \tau \nu \epsilon )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \kappa )</td>
<td>( \tau \nu \zeta )</td>
<td>( \tau \nu \zeta )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \kappa )</td>
<td>( \tau \nu \delta )</td>
<td>( \tau \nu \delta )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \kappa )</td>
<td>( \tau \nu \zeta )</td>
<td>( \tau \nu \zeta )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \kappa )</td>
<td>( \tau \nu \theta )</td>
<td>( \tau \nu \theta )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \kappa )</td>
<td>( \tau \nu \zeta )</td>
<td>( \tau \nu \zeta )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Since this was written, the same explanation of this sign has been offered by Mr. F. E. Robbins in P. Mich. III, 151, introduction.
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>349°</td>
<td>350°</td>
<td>350°</td>
<td>351°</td>
<td>351°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>58°</td>
<td>51°</td>
<td>26°</td>
<td>0°</td>
<td>26°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>350°</td>
<td>351°</td>
<td>351°</td>
<td>352°</td>
<td>353°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>351°</td>
<td>352°</td>
<td>353°</td>
<td>353°</td>
<td>354°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>52°</td>
<td>35°</td>
<td>0°</td>
<td>20°</td>
<td>20°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>352°</td>
<td>353°</td>
<td>54°</td>
<td>354°</td>
<td>355°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>353°</td>
<td>354°</td>
<td>355°</td>
<td>356°</td>
<td>356°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>46°</td>
<td>45°</td>
<td>53°</td>
<td>26°</td>
<td>58°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>354°</td>
<td>355°</td>
<td>356°</td>
<td>357°</td>
<td>358°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>355°</td>
<td>356°</td>
<td>357°</td>
<td>358°</td>
<td>359°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>355°</td>
<td>356°</td>
<td>357°</td>
<td>358°</td>
<td>359°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>356°</td>
<td>357°</td>
<td>358°</td>
<td>359°</td>
<td>360°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>356°</td>
<td>357°</td>
<td>358°</td>
<td>359°</td>
<td>360°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>357°</td>
<td>358°</td>
<td>359°</td>
<td>360°</td>
<td>360°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>357°</td>
<td>358°</td>
<td>359°</td>
<td>360°</td>
<td>360°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>358°</td>
<td>359°</td>
<td>360°</td>
<td>360°</td>
<td>360°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>359°</td>
<td>360°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>360°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table is given as it stands in Halma (op. cit., pp. 32, 40, 48), without correction of misprints or other errors.
524. ASTRONOMICAL WORK.

Acquired in 1917. ? Fayum. 6 x 10.3 cm. Third century.

Fragment of a roll perhaps containing a description of the planets; the columns are separated by vertical lines drawn in red ink and the paragraphs by similar lines drawn horizontally. From the reference to Capricorn in l. 16, Dr. J. G. Smyly suggests that the papyrus gave the positions of the planets on some definite date, for which cf. e.g. Ptolemy, *Almagest* 9, 7 (ed. Heiberg, i, p. 264) and 9, 10 (ib., p. 288). The text is written in a bold, rounded hand, distinctly larger at the beginning of a paragraph than at the end. On the verso, across the fibres, are what may be the ends of two lines, separated by 1.2 cm., in a small cursive hand:

Col. i.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>όλε</td>
<td>Αφροδει</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ηροτην</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ουλχανεν</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μοιρων</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Διος</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Col. ii.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Αφροδίτης αστηρ; |  }
| Φωςφ[ορ |  }
| πεμπτή |  }
| τνγχανι |  }
| μενος ι  |  }
| Διοκερ[ |  }
| τερεν λ |  }
| γωνω ι |  }
| τοις αρι [ |  }
| εωαν δι[σων? |  }

1. όλε: the stroke interpreted as the cross-bar of an ε might be merely a dash or part of a symbol.

3. No horizontal red line separates this line from l. 2: hence it is unlikely that the gap was filled with a title or a heading, e.g. Διος αστηρ.

9. If, as Διος suggests, this paragraph gave an account of the planet Jupiter, the next probably dealt with Mars.

14. In the gap before this line, equivalent, as is the gap above, to the space of two lines, there was probably a heading or title—perhaps Διος αστηρ.

525. MATHEMATICAL TREATISE.

Acquired in 1917. 12.8 x 11.2 cm. Fourth century.

Top corner of a leaf of a papyrus codex, containing an unknown mathematical work. It is highly probable that a good deal of each line—at least half—has been lost, and the
proportions of the fragment (upper margin 4.5 cm., side margin 5 cm.) suggest that the dimensions of the codex were considerable. The text is written in a small, but broad and rounded hand, not unlike that of the Lysias (489); the ink is reddish brown in colour, while corrections (ll. 13 and 19) have been made in black ink by a cursive hand. There are no accents, symbols (apart from the σ’ in l. 17), or punctuation. The writing on the recto has faded badly and even with the help of a mercury vapour lamp is not readily legible. In the absence of other fragments, the nature of the work cannot be decided.

Recto.

\[\ldots\]

Verso.

\[\ldots\]

1. τῇματον or τῇμα τῶν, suggested by Dr. J. G. Smyly, is a possible reading; in that case the preceding δ (the base is too straight for it to be an α, although β is a possibility) might be a numeral.

2. τοῦ ζν cannot be read, but the letters are so widely spaced that τοῦ ζν might be read.

γὰρ ἵστατον Smyly (who also suggests ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡμεροφαινον in l. 5).
526. MATHEMATICAL FRAGMENT.

Acquired in 1917. Fayum. 2.5 x 7.5 cm. Third century.

Fragment of a mathematical or astronomical table, too small for its purpose to be identified. P. Harr. 60 may be a parallel text. Written in a sloping semi-cursive in black ink; as in 522-524 the lines, both vertical and horizontal, are in red ink, although in 1. 6 the writer has slipped and the figures are also written in red ink. A peculiarity of the papyrus is that it consists of three layers of papyrus placed on top of one another instead of two, as is usual, with the result that on both sides the fibres run in the same direction. Another fragment of the same text, perhaps joining on the top of 526, survives, but is too rubbed for more than two or three figures to be visible. The verso is blank.

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
| \delta & \kappa \theta & \omega \\
| \kappa \zeta & \omega \\
| \kappa \gamma & \omega \\
\end{array}
\]

4. These two squares have been left blank, as have those in 1. 14.

11. Probably the writer's intention was to leave these squares blank as well, and the stroke reaching up from 1. 12 may be no more than a prolongation of the dash above the 0 in 1. 12. This should indicate a fraction and, as the 0 is written partly over the red lines, it may belong to the preceding column; in this case the sign that follows it is more probably the symbol for zero (see above, p. 149) than that for ½.

527. ASTROLOGICAL TREATISE.


This text is written on the verso of the Sallust (473), but in the reverse direction, i.e. the lower margin of the Sallust forms the upper margin of the present work. It is
written in a square and rather heavy hand which, although individual letters resemble those found in second-century texts, gives the impression of being considerably later; the difference in age between this hand and the square, regular script found in codices of the fourth century (e.g. the Lysias, 489) may not be very great; \( \nu, \kappa, \eta \), and the first down stroke of \( \eta \) all reach above the general level of the line, as does \( \beta \) which is unusually tall and has a peculiar detached flourish through the lower loop; \( \nu \) is square and broad. There is no punctuation; but a small space is sometimes left after the end of a sentence, and a paragraphus has been placed under \( I. 99 \), perhaps to mark the end of the invocation; the diaeresis is occasionally placed over \( \nu \) and \( \iota \). For the dimensions of the roll see the introduction to 473. The text itself, apparently a general treatise on astrological principles, is of some interest. In A—the Oxyrhynchus fragment—the writer describes the correlation between the planets in their various positions and the stages of human life. In B, probably separated by a considerable gap from A, he appears to be proving his thesis by reference to animal life; e.g. animals (excluding fish) that live in the water (in \( \gamma \nu \rho \alpha \circ \omicron \sigma \iota \alpha \iota \alpha \) are found only in certain localities (here the reference to India in l. 65 is of interest), and their existence is determined by the movement of the stars. Arguing \textit{a fortiori} that the same principle must hold true of human life, the writer, without any preparation, then breaks into a quasi-religious invocation, which suggests that the treatise may have been in dialogue form. Soon after this the text fails us; but it appears that in the fragmentary col. iv the writer went in some detail into the geography of Egypt. There is no clue to the identity of the author; the fact that his choice of words can often be paralleled from Vettius Valens may simply be due to their common subject. One fact, however, does emerge from the \( \pi \alpha \rho \omega' \ \eta \mu \nu \iota \) of l. 6x, that is that the writer was a native of Egypt, which may account for the references to the fauna and geography of that country.

(A) P. Oxy. Inv. s.n.

Col. i.

Frag. (a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. 18 letters</th>
<th>( \lambda \alpha )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \iota )</td>
<td>( \iota )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \lambda \iota )</td>
<td>( \lambda \iota )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \lambda \iota \nu )</td>
<td>( \lambda \iota \nu )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \lambda \nu \pi \eta \nu )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \pi \eta \nu )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \lambda \iota \nu )</td>
<td>( \lambda \iota \nu )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \lambda \omega \nu )</td>
<td>( \lambda \omega \nu )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \iota )</td>
<td>( \iota )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \pi \nu )</td>
<td>( \pi \nu )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \nu )</td>
<td>( \nu )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \iota )</td>
<td>( \iota )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \nu )</td>
<td>( \nu )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \iota \nu )</td>
<td>( \iota \nu )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \nu )</td>
<td>( \nu )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \nu )</td>
<td>( \nu )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frag. (b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. 20 letters</th>
<th>( \nu )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \nu )</td>
<td>( \nu )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \nu )</td>
<td>( \nu )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \nu )</td>
<td>( \nu )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \nu )</td>
<td>( \nu )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \nu )</td>
<td>( \nu )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( 1 \) The view that the stars determined the lives of animals no less than of men was ridiculed by the opponents of astrology, in particular by Cicero (\textit{Div. ii. 47}); a \textit{reductio ad absurdum} was not difficult: see Boeckh-Leclercq, \textit{L'Astraglogie Grecque}, pp. 585 sq.
527. ASTROLOGICAL TREATISE

Col. ii.  
Frag. (a).  

ζωής καὶ διαμοιγής τὸ ωρο
σκόπουν καὶ ταυτὰ μὲν οὐτῶς
εἴπει εἰς ἐκ ἐνακτίων συνε
στήκει τὸ παῦ καὶ εὐαλλαξ
30 παλιν εἰς τὸν πρεσβύτερων
τὰ δυνόμα καὶ ἀρχόμενων
μὲν ἔγειται τὰ αὐστρόκοποι
τὰ τελομένων δὲ τὰ δυ
νοτὰ παλιν δὲ αὐς εἰς τὸν
μεσοσχόλους καὶ αὐτῷ
σουρανύτους οὗ ἄυτος λογοῦ[σ]
40 ἔγειται μὲν γάρ τὸ μετεύκορν]

(B) P. Ryl.  

Col. i.  
[...] η [ποιον] ζωον φυσίς[α]
[...] κεκριμένην αρι
Θρει περιοίδους καὶ εἰς τὸ
55 [...] πικόν του επόν εν Ἀι
[γυπτα] η καὶ μονή γενό
[ταὶ το πεύγην ο]ραν ἑκάλε
[στὶ τὴν τα]υμν παλιν δ αὐ εν ν
[γάρα οὐμία κατὰ τοῦτον ὅθεν]
60 [...] οριαζαί οὐν ἔπος
[ποταμος ο] παρ ἡμεῖν γενό
[μενος καὶ] ο ἐρειδόδειος μο
[νὰ ταυτὰ ζωα ἐν γαρ ὀνυτια]
[κατοικεὶς γεννᾶται δὲ
65 [...] ζωα εν τῳ Κολχικῳ
[κολπα] τῆς Ἐδικής ἀπερ
[φυσιν μειρον ἀλληλων]
[διαφερόντων φύσιν δὲ ἀλλα
[...] η τι][θηνον γονα τα
70 [...] ομμίων καὶ εἰς των
[ἀλλων ζωον ο] αυτος λογος οθεν
[ἐχει αὐτα]γκαίως εἰδεναι τα

Col. ii.  
[καθ' εκαστήν χωραν κοσμικως]
[διατελούμενον κατὰ την τον]
75 [...] οπερ φυσιν απαρ
[γως απογεγραμμένοιν διαφέρειν καὶ τα]
[τερον ἀνθρωπός οὐν οὐν]
[ἔργων ἐν πατρὶ δημοτὴν τὸν]
[ [...] μενον καὶ παντα πει]
80 [...] εκδιίδεσαι ἡμᾶς την
[ [...] c. 12] θεωρίαν των
[ [...] c. 12] καὶ παράδο
[ [...] ναι μην τοὺς ἐφευρετὸν τε]
[ [...] c. 13] τοὺς μετατης
85 [...] c. 14] νοις ονδι[ε]

40. ὑπέγειον Π. 45. ὃ[ Π.
points of decline that are decisive. The ascendant points are dominant over things in their beginning, the only animals that live in a damp habitat. Then there are many animals that breed in the Colchian gulf this is so since the whole is compounded of opposites—and by alternation in the case of older people it is the habitats (are found animals) such as the hippopotamus which exists among us and the crocodile. These are points of nadir. For the point of zenith leads men when they are young to confidence and success whereas are the zenith

causes in each country in accordance with the movements of the planets. Similarly there are necessarily differences in human affairs. 

two intermediate, the which the planets determining human life pass (in general, see Bonche-Leclercq, see Vettius Valens, 75.

is native to Egypt, where alone exists the winged creature which they call the ibis. Then again in damp
to instruct us in the ... theory of ... and to hand down to ... thy priests ...”

II. 52–83: ‘The nature of this animal is a mystery; it calculates the period of time, and further this creature

II. 26-44: ‘(In the case of younger people) the ascendant position (controls) life and continuance—and

For the influence of the ... to express the various planets at the point of ascent or decline. For the influence of the άραστον (−ος) cf. P. Mich. III, 149, ix. 21: κέντρον δὲ λέγεται άραστον μεταφοράμα δένων ἑκάτης. The plural is used in this text (below, II. 31, 32) to express the various planets at the point of ascent or decline.

19 sqq. The position of this fragment is not certain, but this seems to be the most likely position for it.

26. το άραστον, sc. κέντρον. The κέντρον are the four cardinal points or positions in the heavens through which the planets determining human life pass (in general, see Bouché-Leclercq, op. cit., pp. 257 sqq.); the four are the zenith (μεταφοράμα κέντρον ή μεταφοράμα), the nadir (ἀντιμεταφοράμα ή ἑκάτης κέντρον), and the two intermediate, the άραστον κέντρον in the ascent and the δέκαν ή ἑκάτης in the descent (for the last see Vettius Valens, 75. 24 (ed. Kroll) κέντρον δὲ γίνεται ἑκάτης ἑκάτης γίνεται τὸ ἑκάτης; elsewhere he uses τὸ δέκαν κέντρον, e.g. 74. 25; 94. 26), cf. P. Mich. III, 149, ix. 21: κέντρον δὲ λέγεται άραστον μεταφοράμα δένων ἑκάτης. The plural is used in this text (below, II. 31, 32) to express the various planets at the point of ascent or decline. For the influence of the άραστον (−ος) cf. P. Mich. III, 149, ix. 21 ἀπὸ τοῦ άραστον τὰ περὶ ἄσεις ἐγγυεῖται.

27. καὶ ταῦτα ἐκλ. This clause, down to τοῦ καρ, is a parenthesis, the argument being picked up again with καὶ εἰςάλαξ. For a similar expression of the theory of opposites, introduced into Greek thought by Anaximander (see Burnet, Early Greek Philosophy, p. 56, cf. the statement attributed to Pherecydes (Diels, Fragmente der Vorsokratiker, ii, p. 203): ὁ Περσέπες ἔλεγεν ἐν τῇ ἐρωτῇ τὸ ἔλεγεν τοῦ Δᾶμα μεταβεβλῆθαι τὸν Δᾶμα μεταβεβλῆθαι διὸ τῇ τῆς κέντρον τῆς τῶν ἐναίσθησις καὶ πάθης ἐκλέγεται. μεταφοράμα (τοῦ) κέντρου καὶ τῆς τῶν ἐναίσθησις καὶ πάθης ἐκλέγεται.

29. εἰςάλαξ occurs frequently in Vettius Valens.

37. At the end of this line a word is required to denote the position of a planet at the zenith. The terminus technicus is μεταφοράμα, but this is too long for the space. Another word also used by Vettius Valens is ἐκείργειος (e.g. 141. 19) which suggests that μεταφοράν or μεταφοράν might be read here.

42. The end of this line may have been left blank at the conclusion of the sentence.

43. τά κείμενα κέντρα seems a natural expression for the cardinal points; τεταρτά, which might be expected, cannot be read, as it would involve a false break τεταρτά.
527. ASTROLOGICAL TREATISE

49 sq. These two fragments, which contain on one side the bottom of a column of the Greek, on the other the top of a column of the Latin text, belong to a column not otherwise represented; the relative position of the two texts makes it impossible for them to be placed either in col. i or ii.

51. Beneath both frag. (c) and frag. (d) part of the lower margin survives; but the two pieces do not directly connect, so that the position in the line of frag. (d) is uncertain.

52. The bird described in these lines is clearly the phoenix.

53-55. The wording of this sentence is clumsy and the expression inconsequent; it reads like an abbreviation of a fuller text. While I do not feel any confidence in the restoration given above, it is hard to see what can be suggested except some form of ἀπλάπτει. In the next line the restoration is still more doubtful.

Unless ΤΟΥΤ ΛΕΩ is a limiting phrase, 'that is to say, in Egypt', which would leave little space for the sentence so defined, ΤΟΥΤ' must refer to ΤΟΥΤΚΟΒ is suspect because we should expect there to be five, or even six, letters in the gap. For the sense cf. Tacitus, Ann. vi. 28 ceterum aspici aliquando in Aegypto eam volucrum [i.e. the phoenix] non ambigitur.

57. Ἡβε is always feminine, so that the οὐ cannot be explained as a case of attraction to a following τον.

The writing is careless all through this passage; cf. γεω (sic) in l. 56 and διαυ (probably for διου) in l. 59.

59. οὐσία: cf. l. 63. The dictionaries cite no parallel to this use of οὐσία = habitat.

60. J. ορείων. The letter before the ο can hardly be anything except a ε, π, or possibly a σ. Some compound of σφΔΩΣ would seem to be indicated, but I can find none giving the required sense. Nor can εποδέατα = are found in abundance, even if the statement were true.

65. Κόλυμος κόλπος was the ancient name for the Gulf of Manar at the south-east extremity of India; the town, or mart, of Κόλυμος was known to the Greeks for its pearl fisheries. Apart from this text, there appear to be no references to the place except in the geographers, cf. RE, xi. 1, 1070-71.

69. γοη should perhaps be read γοην, i.e. organs, or methods, of generation rather than race, tribe: on the distinction between fishes and seals in this respect cf. Aristotle, H. A. (ed. Bekker), e 2. 540b 23; ζ 12. 567b 2.

73. κορμικός. The adverb, rare in other authors, occurs several times in Vettius Valens.

77. The abandonment of exposition for an invocation and the introduction of an interlocutor (ἐφι, l. 78) is very sudden and does not seem to have been prepared for by anything in the preceding paragraph. The word πατὴρ suggests that we meet here the idea that the learner stands to the teacher or adept in the relation of son to father; this idea is common in contemporary religious literature, cf. Reitzenstein, Hellenistische Mysterienreligionen, p. 40 (who points out that πατηρ was a title in the Isis cult), and Dieterich, Eine Mithrailiturgie, pp. 52, 146, 151. But it might suit the context better to refer πατηρ to a god, in which case there are parallels in the Hermetica (cf. the index to W. Scott's edition). I am indebted to Prof. Campbell Bonner for this note. It is likely (cf. νομισμ in l. 94 and -δόσα in l. 96) that the invocation extended into the next column; very probably it ended at the conclusion of the paragraph in l. 99 with ίος.

85. The position of the Latin text on the recto makes it clear that this line is not the last of the column.

86. Certainly not παράσημον: . . .

96. Perhaps ταλ μεσμι; but the line is long as it is.

528. ASTROLOGICAL WORK.

Acquired in 1917. 4.7 x 12.3 cm. Second to third century. PLATE 6.

Right-hand side of a column containing part of 28 lines, rather closely packed, written along the fibres in a small rounded book-hand of the later second or early third century A.D. (cf. Schubart, Pap. Graec. Berol. 31). There are no accents or punctuation marks; the verso is blank. If the supplement in l. 13 is correct there were 19 to 20 letters to the line. To judge from the vocabulary, the work was astrological or magical in character.
7. *μέρις* is found in astrological texts, e.g. in P. Mich. III, 149, iii. 25, in connexion with the moon (cf. *σε* in the preceding line); but *εφημερίς* would be an equally possible reading here.

10. The first letter in this line looks like a *ν*, but no verb ending in *-ερχω* is known; *α* cannot be read.

18. Perhaps *αλλ' εις τοιν διαμέτρου ή διαμετρέω*.

19. *παράπτεσα* presumably for *παραπτήσα*.

---

529. TREATISE ON SURGERY.

Acquired in 1920. 15 x 26 cm. Third century. PLATE 7.

Part of a leaf of a codex with two columns to a page; the leaf is badly torn and neither column is intact. The codex was of considerable size, and the writing closely packed with 50 lines to the column on the recto and on the verso. The average length of
a line is 6 cm.; the average number of letters twenty. The lower margin is 4 cm. deep, and a page of text measures 21 × 13 cm. The hand, close to that of the Chester Beatty Gospels and Acts, is a small, angular and slanting book-hand of the type common in the middle and later third century. There are no accents, lectional signs or punctuation, except the diaeresis; corrections or additions are by the original hand. The surface of the papyrus is badly rubbed in places, thus adding to the difficulty of interpreting an already fragmentary text.

The text appears to contain instructions as to the method of treating an injury to the shoulder—a compound fracture with dislocation and separation of the acromion. Dr. E. T. Withington, to whose assistance I am much indebted, writes: ‘It seems to be an account of apparatus required and methods to be used in treating a severe joint injury—a general smash-up of the shoulder-joint being taken as a sample, as Hippocrates does in his treatise on joints in the case of simple dislocation. The language seems very like that of the fragments of Heliodorus (1st/2nd cent. A.D.) quoted in Oribasius, although the largest verbal correspondence I can find is Orib. 49. 30. 18: μετὰ δὲ τὴν αὔτάρκη τάσιν [cf. I. 90].’ In another letter Dr. Withington writes that ‘the account of the treatment itself is obscure... but I come nearest to certainty in concluding that this text is not to be found in any Greek medical writer extant or in print’. Several new words occur—ἀπεξαρθρεύω, χαμαφάρμων, πρίζο—but there is no certain clue to the authorship of this treatise. The writer refers to himself in the first person (II. 58, 69) and alludes to another of his works, the τεχνικός λόγος (I. 59). To judge from the size of the page and the closeness of the writing, the treatise was probably of considerable extent. There is nothing to prove that recto precedes verso; but it seems probable, as recto column i begins with an account of things required (cf. Hippocrates, περὶ ἀρθρών, 36).

Recto.

Col. i.

[... ] τολε δαι και ρευ μη[...]. [...]

20 αυταρκως κ. [...]. ... των επι.

σαρξ [...]. ... εντελεμενοι[...]

30 μετὰ τοις των εν αρατ[...].

τοις [...] απρι[...]. και τα μεθα[

35 της σφραγες επιμελειαν

της αποστάσεως εν αριστῃ[...]

ωουν συνεχως ε[...].

40 μετα διαθεσεως η αναλο[...].
 Col. ii.
(First 13 lines missing.)

Col. i.
(First 14 lines missing.)

Verso.

160 SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL TEXTS
5 sqq.: ‘For in the case of some bones ... it is not advisable for (7) a patient undergoing an excision to vomit beforehand. These are the applications which ought to be had in readiness. For the initial treatment let warm preparations be in readiness ... balm, vinegar, wine, olive oil, honey mixed with water, everything similar to these ... and for a (similar) condition of the knees let an equivalent treatment be tried ...’

38 sqq.: ‘but rarely in the case of the armpit. The reason is this: the wound is always caused either by the actual bone being thrust within and becoming (7) detached and unprotected ... In both cases it is advisable to ... continuously the outer dislocation, but only occasionally the dislocation within the armpit. For the outer parts are distended ...’

55 sqq.: ‘What then are the means of prevention in these cases, what the method of setting and what of cutting off [the bone], I have set out in the Practical Treatise. When this has been learnt it is time to give instruction in the method of setting those bones which allow of being set and in the method of cutting off those that need to be removed, in cases where the conditions are unfavourable for setting. Other authorities (advise) that the patient be disposed in a ... position, but we prefer the recumbent position. The Alexandrian disposition is the most painful, the recumbent position the safer. It is safer to place the patient at times on his back, at times on his face ...’

87 sqq.: ‘But now the more convenient way to handle (the bone) is by holding it firmly and stretching it. After the automatic extension of the bone let the fingers be lowered to the wound and through them let the limb be moved back from its abnormal position (7) to the normal position ...’

121 sqq.: ‘There is another peculiarity. As a result of this operation the dislocation of the acromion (7 is reduced). Consequently it is necessary both to convey the motion caused by the levers and to select the
aforementioned instruments for the reduction of a dislocated bone. Having given instructions as to the correct manner of setting a dislocated bone with wound ...

2. \(\omega\varepsilon\delta[\omega]\). The uncertainty of the reading in the next line makes it doubtful whether \(\omega\nu\) should be placed in 2 or 3.

12. A line, or perhaps another letter, seems to have been made above the superfluous \(\nu\) at the end of the line.

13. \(\chi\mu\alpha\phi\alpha\mu\alpha\rho\omega\nu\): Addendum lexicis. I can find no clue to the meaning of this word, unless it be another new word \(\kappa\varepsilon\mu\rho\alpha\phi\alpha\mu\alpha\rho\\) which occurs several times in an unpublished account of the early fourth century in the Rylands collection; this is probably to be connected with \(\varphi\alpha\mu\alpha\rho\\), radish, and in the present passage some kind of oil may be meant.

16. Perhaps \(\kappa\alpha\) should be corrected to \(\kappa\alpha\alpha\).

37. \(\alpha\pi\xi\alpha\beta\rho\varepsilon\iota\): Addendum lexicis. A stronger form of \(\varepsilon\kappa\alpha\beta\rho\varepsilon\iota\), to dislocate.

43. \(\delta\kappa\varepsilon\kappa\varepsilon\) (or \(\delta\gamma\)) does not appear to be used by the medical writers.

56. \(\alpha\sigma\gamma\omega\varepsilon\\nu\sigma\nu\varepsilon\) is puzzling. The meaning exhaustion does not suit the context: whether prevention is legitimate is doubtful. The sense might be which need prohibition, i.e. those cases which are not to be dealt with at all.

The whole sentence would be easier could we assume that the writer has mistakenly placed accusatives instead of genitives after \(\delta\epsilon\), i.e. to understand which of these cases need, etc.; but the general accuracy of the text does not allow of this.

58. \(\tau\kappa\iota\delta\rho\varepsilon\iota\): Addendum lexicis.

59. \(\gamma\varepsilon\kappa\iota\mu\kappa\delta\kappa\gamma\) might be translated either (a) systematic treatise (but this would apparently apply equally to the present work); or (b) practical handbook. Greek usage would allow of either; perhaps (b) is preferable.

66. The addition of \(\mu\eta\) seems essential to make sense of the sentence.

70. \(\alpha\lambda\varepsilon\zeta\alpha\beta\rho\iota\alpha\nu\): Dr. Withington suggests that this may be similar to the Thessalian straight-backed chair used for dislocations and mentioned in Hippocrates (\(\pi\varepsilon\kappa\iota\\delta\epsilon\\beta\rho\\), 7).

87. The letter before \(\mu\varepsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\nu\) might well be \(\tau\): \(\alpha\sigma\varepsilon\sigma\tau\\mu\\alpha\sigma\) (cf. l. 123) would be the obvious supplement were it not that the traces in l. 18 do not suit \(\sigma\alpha\) and it is doubtful in any case if there is room for three letters.

89. \(\varepsilon\nu\rho\gamma\eta\mu\alpha\) does not appear to be used by medical writers, though \(\varepsilon\nu\rho\gamma\eta\) (in a different sense) is.

94. Either \(\sigma\varepsilon\mu\varepsilon\sigma\mu\alpha\) should be understood with \(\tau\) \(\kappa\alpha\alpha\) \(\varphi\varepsilon\\nu\) or else (perhaps more probably) we should read \(\tau\sigma\phi\), sc. \(\tau\varepsilon\varepsilon\omega\). Dr. Withington has pointed out that the \(\pi\varphi\alpha\) \(\varphi\varepsilon\\nu\) \(\ldots\) \(\kappa\alpha\alpha\) \(\varphi\varepsilon\) contrast is used by Heliodorus, though not quite in the same context, in the chapter of Oribasius (49. 30. 13) already quoted.

123. \(\alpha\sigma\varepsilon\sigma\mu\alpha\), 'dislocation'. \(\alpha\nu\tau\kappa\nu\alpha\sigma\) would be more in accordance with medical usage.

128. \(\kappa\alpha\lambda\iota\) is the only form given in the new Liddell & Scott: perhaps \(\kappa\varepsilon\kappa\alpha\lambda\iota\) should be read, but cf. \(\kappa\varepsilon\kappa\alpha\lambda\iota\), l. 43.

131. Cróner has pointed out (\(\textit{APF.}\) ii. 476) that the use of participial adverbs such as \(\varepsilon\nu\mu\varepsilon\) \(\nu\) is characteristic of the style of Heliodorus.

530. MEDICAL APHORISMS.

Acquired in 1917. Frag. (a). 6·8 x 13 cm. Third century.

Three fragments of a codex containing medical aphorisms on a variety of topics. A number of them (see the notes) are already known from the \(\lambda\varepsilon\phi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\) of Hippocrates, but the order in which they appear, and occasionally the form, is different. Others I have been unable to identify; but it is certain that they are not all Hippocratean. There is no trace of 'Ionic' forms in the language. The text is written continuously, one maxim being
separated from the next by a short forked line. The fragments do not appear to touch, and may not come from the same leaf; none of them gives us a complete line, which must have contained about fifty letters. The papyrus—originally of a poor quality—is badly damaged; on the recto large parts of the surface have flaked off. The text is written in a slightly sloping, bold hand of the third century, but early rather than late in that century, which has also added omitted passages above the line.

Frag. (a).

Recto.

5 μεταστασιν ἅγεις [ 7αριστηθεὶσαν ηδύης [ ] χολον μεταβο[...]. τ. [ ] ταὐτοφ. [ ] εἰχομενη η[...]. ἑπερι [ ] εν [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [580. MEDICAL APHORISMS
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μέλλει > — εὖτε... εἰστὶν
καὶ... καὶ συμφόροι
μὲν μὲν τοὺς σωματοὺς
αὐρρητήμαν εὐστὶν προσδοκὶ

τυρεφόδη [α]πασίμους εἰ

? ελκεῖς ευπάρκειον θ[e]ρίους?

θερμώντας... τοι[Δ][Δ]

τούτων εἰκὼν καὶ [εκπνήσ]ων εἰ

ασφαλίσθω πρόμηθη... [Δ]

ρέγχων... ζησάμουν [το]τά[ν]ων [καὶ... μὲν ἐκθέοις... εἰσιν]

ἐφιλαμβάνω σῶμα του[το]ς ἐκ

δικράτης [θ]ερμ[ήθ]ων

Frag. (b).

Verso.

Frag. (c).

Verso.
4. The τα έ, written above this line, and continued in ll. 5 and 6 (l. 4 itself is part of the preceding aphorism), appears to be the beginning of Αρθ. v. 7 to ἐπιληπτική ὀδοιποίησιν ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμῆς γίνεται, μετά τους ἔχειν ὀδοιποίησιν δὲ πάντες καὶ ἔχουσιν ἐνών γίνεται, τὰ πολλὰ συναπαθήσασθε, though in l. 6 the text of the papyrus diverges. Before τα έ, γίνεται the concluding word of Αρθ. v. 5 cannot be read.

12-13. = Αρθ. v. 9 (the words are in a different order) φίλους γίνονται μάλλον ἡλικίας τῆς ἀπὸ ὑστωκαλέσκει ἕνων μέχρι τριήμερον πάντες.

53. Cf. e.g. Αρθ. vi. 16 ἐπὶ πλευράς ἡ περιπλεκόμενης ἐχομένη διαρροία ἐπιτευγότας, κακάν.

63-70. Αρθ. v. 22 (in the papyrus the paragraphs are misplaced) τὸ θερμὸν ἐκπαιδεύκω, οὐτὶ γὰρ παυεῖ θέλη, μέγιστον σημείον ἐν ἀσφαλείᾳ, ἐβάλα μαλάκει, ἔχρισεν, ἀνάτομον, ῥεόν, σπασμοῖς, τετάνοις παραγγελίαις τῶν ἐν κεφαλής καρπημάτων λόγιον πλήθος ἐν διάφοροι δότες κατήγματι, μάλιστος ἐκ τούτων ἥμιλε μέλος, τούτων ἐν κεφαλής ἐλέες ἔχουσιν· καὶ ὀδόντα ἐκ ἀπόφθεγμα τυπέει, ἐλκυσθεῖσα, καὶ ἑρυθρὰν ἀνθομάκισσα, ἔρημος, ἀδιόφις, ὀδόρροις, κύστεις, τούτωσι τὸ θερμόν φιλίων καὶ κρίμων, τὸ ἐν ψυχρὸν πολέμιον καὶ κτέων. The last two clauses have changed places in the papyrus.

531. MEDICAL RECEIPTS.

Acquired in 1920. 21.5 x 8.4 cm. Third to second century B.C.

PLATE 8.

This strip from the upper part of a roll contains on the recto the final words of one column, a second column complete in breadth, and about half of a third column. The lines are remarkably long (cf. Schubart, Das Buch, pp. 64-5), and a column of text, excluding the initial words of the paragraphs, measures 12 cm. in breadth. The hand is cramped and angular and, if hardly beautiful, has a decided character of its own; the most notable letters are the υ with its long sweep below the line and the ν with its first hasta reaching considerably lower than the second. In general, it has an archaic appearance, although some letters, e.g. the ω and the α, do not suggest a very early date, and a resemblance to P. Hib. 27 may be noted, although the latter is considerably freer; I should assign it to the end of the third or to the first half of the second century B.C. The same hand, writing rather more carelessly and in a more cursive style, was responsible for two columns of writing on the verso; there is no trace of writing to the left of col. i so that it is not necessary to suppose that the whole of the verso was written on. The first column is so badly rubbed that, apart from the ends of the lines, only a few letters here and there can be recognized (possibly ρύγχρυς is to be identified in l. 3 and βαλασαρίμων in l. 4); in consequence it has not seemed worth while to give a full transcription of this column, and only the final letters of each line, where the papyrus is less rubbed, have been printed. There is no punctuation; but the receipts are separated from one another by paragraphi, and occasionally a small blank space is left to indicate the beginning of a new sentence.
The initial word of each receipt projects so far as almost to touch the last word of the corresponding line in the preceding column; the average space between the columns is 1.8 cm.

Such lists of medical prescriptions are by no means uncommon in the papyri; cf. the list in C. H. Oldfather, *The Greek Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt*, pp. 43 sq., to which may now be added P. Ross.-Georg. I, 19, a list of drugs in some ways similar to 531, P. Lit. Lond. 170, 171, P.S.I. X, 1180, P. Iand. V, 86, and P. Giss. Bibl. IV, 45; the majority of them belong to the Roman period, and 531 may claim to be earlier than any similar text. Dr. E. T. Withington, who has given me generous help with this text, informs me that these prescriptions are probably not known from any other source; only one other instance of a κλειστήριον (l. 15) is known (Galen, vii. 443), and no Greek medical writers recommend otters’ kidneys for their medical properties. The coincidence of II. 16–19 with Hippocrates, *De Morbis Mulierum*, 2, 200, is sufficient to prove (as, for the matter of that, is the mention of otters’ kidneys as a useful ingredient) that the receipts are of Greek and not of Egyptian origin.

**Recto.**

Col. i. 10 καθάρσιν ποιεῖν μαραθοῦν καρπὸν κρῆμβον φλοιὸν εὐνύκρινον

Col. ii. 5 πρὸς τοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν υστερῶν πιγμων εὐνύκρινον τοὺς

Col. iii. 25 οτακείων κηριάδος καὶ ροᾶς τα.

The text is in ancient Greek and contains medical prescriptions. The text is a transcription of a papyrus fragment with columns of text, and it contains a list of herbs and their uses. The text is a transcription of a papyrus fragment with columns of text, and it contains a list of herbs and their uses.
581. MEDICAL RECEIPTS

**Col. i.**

| 35 | \( \text{εὐ} \) τοι \( \text{ιδ} \)νον |
| 40 | \( \text{αὐ} \) \( \text{παγη} \) |

**Col. ii.**

| 45 | \( \text{κυπηρου} \) \( \text{κεκαμενη} \) |
| 50 | \( \text{σμυρνης} \) |

**Verso.**

Col. i.

| 10 | \( \text{τα} \) \( \text{αρβρα} \) |
| 15 | \( \text{προς} \) \( \text{ον} \) |
| 20 | \( \text{σι} \) \( \text{γν} \) |
| 25 | \( \text{απροφυς} \) |

11. To make a purge, give (the patient) the fruit of the fennel and the outer leaf of samphire, to be taken in wine.

12. In case of hysterical suffocation, take dried otters' kidneys, as much as can be held in three fingers, and serve in sweet-smelling wine. This is also helpful in the case of pains in the testicles and is an enema for the womb.

13. Item. If, together with choking, coughing supervenes, take equal quantities of red arsenic and unfired sulphur, also four or five almonds; cleanse them and mix well and then (give to the patient) in sweet-smelling wine.

14. Alternatively, onions ... spurge, which is good for the mouth, burnt cypress wood, myrrh, saffron, red arsenic, split alum, ... burnt copper, frankincense ...

15. \( \text{ι} \). \( \text{βο} \)\( \text{πηθε} \).
But rare as the word is, evidence for the use of contraceptives in Egypt, though not, as far as I know, as early as this, may be found elsewhere; e.g. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* iii. 3 (ed. Potter, p. 521), refers to κόλπους ἀειθυμένου ἄνοικου ἐγράφοντας τὰς γυναικας (κόλπους in l. 26 presumably refers not to beans, but to the seeds of the pomegranate mentioned in l. 25: cf. Hippocrates, *De Natura Mullerum,* 32) and elsewhere, in *Paedagogus,* ii (ed. Potter, p. 227), he alludes to φθεοραλ φάμακα: cf. also Hippocrates, *op. cit.* 98. ἄνοικος, in the sense of a medicine for causing barrenness, is quoted in Liddell & Scott from Hippocrates, *Muliebria,* i. 76, and from Dioscorides, i. 77.

26. οὐτητήματα(ς): the restoration seems fairly certain in view of l. 49. References to its use in the preparation of pessaries are frequent in Hippocrates, e.g. *De Nat. Mul.* 97.

35. Dr. Withington informs me that the juice of the greater celandine, δέβος (δέβων), was in common use as a cure for coughs. But it is probable that here δέβων has its common meaning of linen bandage.

43. ζωομένων: cf. Hippocrates, *De Mor. Mul.,* 74.

51. χαλκός κακοκαθεστι: cf. Galen, xiv, p. 462. It also occurs in P.S.I., x. 1180, 73 and 105.

---

**532. HARPOCRATION, Δέκα τῶν Δέκα Ψηφών.**

Acquired in 1917. 10.4 x 9.4 cm. Second to third century.

This fragment of the Δέκα τῶν Δέκα Ψηφών, consisting of the lower part of two columns, is of some interest since our earliest MS. (apart from an epitome of the thirteenth century) is of the fourteenth century, and if with Dindorf (*Harpocratianis Lexicon,* i, p. xxi) and others we place the *floruit* of Harpocration near the end of the second century A.D., it follows that the papyrus is practically contemporary. Not only does the papyrus support the accepted reading of a fragment of Theopompus Comicus, but it supplies two new readings in the text of Harpocration himself (ll. 7 and 18), one of which had already been conjectured by Sauppe, and both of which may be accepted; further, in the gloss on Κεβρῆς, the papyrus clearly quoted the actual words of Ephorus which are not given in our MSS. and are not elsewhere extant. The text, written along the fibres, is in a heavy and slightly irregular book-hand of the later second or third century; κ and β are both larger than the average and reach below the line, while ω has a slightly backward slope. At the bottom of col. ii, probably in a second hand, is a sign resembling a diple with a stroke across it. If we can assume that the gap between col. i and col. ii contained the text preserved in our MSS., we should have to allow for a loss of about 30 lines, i.e. for a column of about 45 lines and, if the upper margin corresponded to the lower one of 2·5 cm., for a roll c. 26 cm. in height. The verso is blank.

The text has been collated with the edition of Dindorf (Oxford, 1853).

Col. i.

P. 271

[kataργυρωσας ηευ(ε)ι(κε)ο(ως)]
[tω προτερον εξει χορηγων]
[παιδι κα]ε επεγραφειν εν την
1. Part of the gloss on καταστημι.
2. το ... ετι codd.; corrected to τῷ ... ἔτη by Valesius.
3. This line (cf. l. 13) is shorter than the rest; the scribe apparently began each gloss on a new line.
4. καὶ: this καὶ—omitted by all the MSS. of Harpocration, an omission followed by Dindorf, and really essential to the sentence—was conjectured by Sauppe in his edition of the fragments of Lysias (Fragmenta Oratorum Atticorum, p. 172 in Baiter and Sauppe's Oratores Attici). This is now confirmed by the reading of the papyrus.
5. 10-13 = Theopompos Comicus, fr. 59 (Kock, i, p. 749). It is interesting to find that the papyrus supports the received reading which has been unnecessarily emended. Lobel has pointed out to me that the meaning of καταπλήξ is not aures obtundere (so Kock), but refers to the beating of a statue of Eilythuia by women in childbirth.
6. All MSS. of Harpocration have ἐν ἄ, not ἐν ἂ, and hence this statement (for which Harpocration is our sole authority) is placed among the fragments of the first book of the Histories of Ephorus (Jacoby, F. Gr. Hist., ii a, p. 45). But it was in the fifth book of his Histories that Ephorus dealt with Asia; hence a statement regarding a city in the Troad would properly find a place there, not in the first book. Consequently the reading of the papyrus may be accepted.
In the subsequent lines the papyrus presumably quoted the relevant passage from Ephorus, which is not given in our MSS. of Harpocration and not known from any other source.

27. This line is rather longer than the average—27 instead of 23 letters. The papyrus may, in ll. 25-6, have read with Ν τοις ἰδιοῖς ἠλείτα, which would reduce this line to its normal length.

533. GRAMMATICAL TABLE.

Acquired in 1920. 6·3 × 13·3 cm. Fourth century.

This and the following grammatical text are of some interest since they are the first among the grammatical papyri to give the conjugation of the verb in full, if we except the school-tablet published by Kenyon in JHS. xxix, pp. 30 sq., which gives a paradigm of the optative and participial forms of νικάω in an unusual order, the singular, dual, and plural in each case being grouped separately. Incidentally they may serve to solve a problem in the history of Greek grammar. From the early Byzantine period down to quite modern times the verb invariably, if unsuitably, selected for conjugation was τύπτω, which owed its predominance to its inclusion by Theodosius of Alexandria in his κανόνες εἰσαγωγικοῖ περὶ κλάσεως δομιστῶν καὶ ἱματῶν, often placed as a supplement to the Αρσ Γραμματικά of Dionysius Thrax (text now in Hilgard, Grammarici Graeci, iv). What is uncertain is the date at which Theodosius wrote; he is known to have been later than Herodian whom he quotes, while the tabula flexionum of τύπτω, excerpted from his κανόνες εἰσαγωγικοῖ is included in the Armenian version of Dionysius Thrax, which was made before the end of the fifth century. The absence of rivals to τύπτω in such tables (Uhlig, in his edition of Dionysius Thrax, p. liii, remarks that τύπτω ‘ab Theodosii temporibus non solum in Graecis scholis regnabat, sed subegit orientem quoque’) suggests that his Canons were recognized as a standard work not long after publication; hence it is probable that the two Rylands papyri, in one of which νικάω, in the other πλάκω is conjugated, belong to the pre-Theodosian era. Since neither need be dated later than the end of the fourth century (and 533 may well be earlier), this would agree well with the supposition that the author of the Canons is the same as the θαυμάσιος γραμματικός Θεόδοσιος mentioned by Synesius in Ep. 4 and that he flourished at the end of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth century (see Uhlig, op. cit., p. xlvii, note). It should, however, be noted that in a schoolboy’s exercise of the sixth century at Vienna (published by Wessely in P. Stud. Pal. i. 2, p. Iviii) the verb of which the pluperfect and the present indicative passive have been written out is γράφω.

Both 533 and 534 agree fairly closely with the tabula flexionum of the Theodosian Canons (printed as Supplement IV to Uhlig’s edition of Dionysius Thrax). There are some differences; the order of tenses is occasionally different, e.g. in 534 the future optative middle precedes the future optative passive instead of vice versa, and there are some variations in the headings, e.g. χρώνος is generally omitted in the Canons (for a more important divergence in 534, see the introduction to that text, p. 173); on the whole, how-
ever, they agree in both terminology and arrangement. For example, in both papyri the first person of the dual is given in those tenses where the Canons give it and omitted where the Canons omit it. The only addition to be noted is that of el to the optative tenses in 534; éan is employed by the Canons also as a ὑποτακτικὸς σύνθεσμος.

534 is better evidence for grammatical practice than the present text, although the latter is the earlier of the two and may even have been written in the late third century; 534 probably belonged to a well-written and well-produced codex, whereas 533 is written on papyrus of notably poor quality, and although the text on the recto follows directly upon that on the verso and actually breaks off in the middle of the conjugation of the infinitives, I should doubt whether the sheet ever formed part of a codex. The hand is clumsy and heavy, with traces of cursive influence; the writing is much larger on the recto which has only twenty-three lines as against the twenty-nine of the verso; the lines are irregular and sprawling. It is not quite certain that recto and verso were written by the same scribe, but the presence of the same form of ν, made by one downward stroke at a sharp slant and a second almost at right angles to it, makes it probable that they were. Possibly, then, 533 was a copy made in school; the unnecessary ἐπικα in ll. 37, 41, and 46, the clumsy erasure in l. 35, and the presence of πεποιηθεναι out of its place in l. 45 point in the same direction.

That the recto follows directly upon the verso is clear from the general arrangement which agrees with that of the Theodosian Canons; consequently only one line has been lost at the top of the papyrus.

I have to thank Miss E. P. Wegener for making a first transcript of this text.

---

**Verso.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>δι(κα) ποιηθησομεθον</th>
<th>ρηθησοσθον</th>
<th>ποιηθησε(θον)</th>
<th>ποιηθησεσται</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ποιηθησοφονται</td>
<td>μελλοντος χρονου</td>
<td>ευκα</td>
<td>ποιηθησομαι</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Recto.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30</th>
<th>[πληθυνικα] πεποιησομεθα:</th>
<th>[πεποιησε]</th>
<th>[πεποιησεται]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>[χ][ε][ρονον εφ]</td>
<td>[ευκλεστω]</td>
<td>[ευκλεστω]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

533. GRAMMATICAL TABLE
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11. *χρονος* is written ą, thus giving the exact form of the Chi Rho symbol: this need not point to a late date, since in P.S.I. X, 1180 (and c. A.D.) it occurs several times as an abbreviation for χρονος.

22. The future perfect is described by the same heading in the Canons of Theodosius: the term is discussed in the scholia to the Canons of Georgius Choeroboscus (Hilgard, Grammatici Graeci, iv. 2, p. 207), who remarks ἵππος ἦν ἰδίον Ἀθηναίας ἱππότων μελλόντα εἰσερχομεν τῷ μετ’ ἄλλον λεγόμενον, δει τι καὶ μέλλων ἰδρυμένος λέγεται.

44. The surface of the papyrus has vanished at this point: it is possible that *ποιησαν* was never written at all and that the space between l. 44 and l. 45 was merely a little greater than usual.

534. GRAMMATICAL TABLE.

Acquired in 1920.  12.8 x 10.2 cm.  Fourth century.

PLATE 9.

See introduction to the preceding text. This leaf from a well-written codex in a small, slanting, and rather square hand of the fourth century (it is akin to that of the fragment of the *Knights* published by Grenfell and Hunt in Mélanges Nicole, pp. 212-17, now Bodleian MS. Gr. Class. (f) 72 (P)) is of some bibliographical interest, although owing to the eccentric arrangement of the paradigms it is not easy to determine the exact format. A further difficulty is that the brown metallic ink in several places is blurred and smudged and is not always easily read even with the help of a mercury vapour lamp; but the hand itself is neat and regular. On each side parts of three columns remain, and above one column part of the upper margin; the columns are closely packed, and there can be no question that they belong to a single page; for one thing, the columns on the recto are written across the intermarginal spaces of the verso, so there can have been no fold here. On the verso (which precedes the recto) it is tolerably easy to fill in the gaps at the bottom of the columns; in the case of cols. i and ii, an additional four or five lines would meet the demands of the text (cf. the notes). But it is clear that recto col. i, whatever the order of the paradigms, cannot follow directly upon verso col. iii. In between we must allow for eight lines to account for the perfect subjunctive active, nine for the present subjunctive passive, and six for the perfect subjunctive passive (the participle would only be written out three times, as in verso col. i). This, with the necessary headings, gives us another twenty-six lines, and deducting four lines to complete col. iii we are left with twenty-two lines. This, on the analogy of cols. i and ii, and allowing for a variation between twenty-one and twenty-two lines to the column, is the amount required to fill one other column,
and the arrangement of the columns on the page (the position of those on the verso does not correspond with that of those on the recto) leaves us only one solution, that one column is missing before col. i verso, and that the missing twenty-two lines formed a column preceding col. i recto; in other words, we must reckon with a codex of four columns to the page.

The arrangement of the other columns of the recto presents more serious difficulties. The subjunctive paradigms end in col. i 70 (on the assumption that the future perfect subjunctive passive was omitted, as the future perfect optative passive almost certainly was—see l. 33, note—although both are to be found in the Theodosian Canons) and in col. ii. 73 the paradigm of the passive participles begins. This gives us four lines between the two—the space required for a simple participle paradigm; it is possible that it was taken up with a heading. The arrangement of the participles is so eccentric—first the masculine participles being given in all tenses, then the feminine, followed presumably by the neuter—that it is less difficult to suppose that after giving the masculine present participle active the scribe went straight on to the passive participles, especially in view of the fact that in recto iii the repetition of the masculine in place of the feminine participle is more proof of carelessness. A further difficulty is that at the end of col. ii we should expect to find the paradigm of the future participles, passive and middle, whereas l. 1 of col. iii begins clearly with περὶ λεγένων

If the column has only twenty-one or twenty-two lines, only four intervene between the aorist participle middle (masculine) and the perfect participle active (feminine)—a space which would be naturally occupied by the present participle active feminine, which as a rule immediately precedes the perfect participle. It is probably better to assume that the arrangement of the participles was eccentric throughout (the future participle is again omitted at its proper place after l. 95), rather than to argue that the columns must have been longer, since verso cols. i and ii, which follow more closely the recognized order of paradigms, cannot be explained on the basis of a column longer than twenty-one or twenty-two lines.

Very little of the upper margin survives and none of the lower, so that the dimensions of the page cannot be calculated. Those, however, of the text can. A column of twenty-one lines would measure 9.8 cm. in height; four such columns, excluding outer and inner margin, would measure c. 19 cm. in width. Thus we find the surprising phenomenon of a codex the text of which is double as broad as it is long. The margin, of course, may not have been in proportion; but even with large upper and lower margins, the page cannot have been as high as it was broad. For these proportions there is no parallel, as far as I know, in any other codex; Schubart, in Das Buch, pp. 130 sqq. and 186, cites many cases where breadth and height are of the same (or nearly the same) dimensions; but none where the breadth is so out of proportion to the height as it is here. (Even with three columns to the page the disproportion would be noticeable.) Further, it is unusual to find a papyrus codex with more than two columns to the page (v. Schubart, op. cit., p. 135); among parchment codices we have the Vaticanus with three and the Sinaiticus with four, but among papyri Schubart quotes no instance of a codex with more than two columns to the page. Such a work as the present one with its necessarily short lines lends itself to this treatment, but even so it is surprising to find four columns. It may be worth noting that as a rule codices with more than one column can be assigned to
the fourth century—the period in which codices whose breadth and height are approximately equal are most common.

Col. i.

ευνοτην ειη[την]
πελευτομενοι
ειμεν ειη[ε] μεσαν
αοριστου

5 ει πλευσι[θεις]
ει πλευσι[θεις]
ει πλευσι[θεις]
ει πλευσι[θεις]
ει πλευσι[θεις]

10 ει πλευσθαιηθης
ει πλευσθαιηθης
μεσου αοριστου
[ει] πλευσμη
[ει] πλευσμη

15 ει πλευσμη
[ει] πλευσμη
[θοι[ν]
[ θοι[ν]

Col. ii.

[μεσον μελλοντος]
[ει] πλευσμη
[ει] πλευσμη

20 ει πλευστο
ει πλευστο[ο]μεθον
ει πλευστο[ο]μεθον
ει πλευστο[ο]μεθον
ει πλευστο[ο]μεθον

25 ει πλευστο[ο]μεθε

Col. iii.

[εαν πλεισ]
[εαν πλεισ]
[εαν πλεισ]
[εαι πλεισ]
[εαι πλεισ]

30 ει πλευσθαιηθης
[ει] πλευσθαιηθης
[ει] πλευσθαιηθης

35 [εαι πλεισ]
[εαι πλεισ]
[εαι πλεισ]
[εαι πλεισ]

40 εαι πλειστε
εαι πλειστε
εαι πλειστε

45 εαι πλευστην
εαι πλευστην
εαι πλευστην

50 εαι πλευσωκι
εαι πλευσωκι

Recto.

[εαι] πλευσωκι

55 [εαι] πλευσωκι
[εαι] πλευσωκι
[εαι] πλευσωκι

60 [μεσ(ου) α'ρ(ιστου) και μελ(ιοντος)]
[εαι] πλευσωκι
[εαι] πλευσωκι
[εαι] πλευσωκι
[εαι] πλευσωκι

65 [εαι πλευσωκι]
[εαι] πλευσωκι
[εαι] πλευσωκι

2. As in the Canons, the participle is repeated only three times in the perfect.

4 sqq. The scribe has made several mistakes in this paradigm: the third person singular is out of place and the third person dual is omitted altogether.

16. Five more lines would be required to complete the aorist optative middle; it is difficult to see what could intervene between this and the future optative middle with which col. ii begins. The future optative middle precedes the future optative passive in col. ii; the reverse order is found in the Canons. Hence the conclusion that the column only had twenty-one lines is hard to escape.

33. The rest of this column would presumably be filled by the remaining three persons of the future optative passive and the heading of the present subjunctive active which begins in col. iii. If the future perfect optative passive were added here (as in the Canons) there would be nothing to fill the corresponding space in col. i; if placed out of order in col. i, the same difficulty occurs about col. ii. Consequently it is probable that this rare tense was omitted.

42. Contrary to the practice of the Canons and of the text itself elsewhere, the aorist precedes the perfect.

51. For the conclusion of this column and the subsequent column see introduction.

52. The heading of this paradigm must have been the last line of the preceding column.

62. εαυτὸν πλευσθε: wrongly transferred from the present subjunctive active.

101-3. Here the masculine forms have been written instead of the feminine.
535. GRAMMATICAL FRAGMENT.

Acquired in 1917. 6.5 x 7.5 cm. Late first/second century.

Written in a fluent cursive hand across the fibres. On the recto, in a very similar hand, is part of two columns of a list of names. Of col. i only a few of the final letters remain; in col. ii the following names can be distinguished: Τανεχθεΐσης, Συνθοὼν, Δοκλής, Κεφάλων, Παπουτός, Πανεθόντας, Ἀρπαῖος, Ταὐρός, Ὀρός, Ἀμάνος. The grammatical text on the verso, which is rather carelessly written, does not appear to be otherwise known; its subject, apparently, is συναλλαφή (coalescence of vowels) in the various dialects. See further Addenda and Corrigenda.

καὶ λέγοντας αὐτῷ [ἐκθέτοι] λόγον μη ποίητε Πιν
διαγικόν εστὶ τὸ σχήμα [οἰνόν το] θνητὰ αὐθῆρε τὸ ἐ χαὶ δ ο ου]
5 δεῖτο ἐν ἀλφή συγκαλλιφεῖται]
ποὶς οὐν δυναται τὸ εἴτερον εἰς]
τὸ θατερον συναλλαφεῖσθαι διὰ διὰ]
tοῦτο στὶ θατερος καὶ []
θατερον λεγοντι οὐς ἢ ὅτινηρ?
10 ἀνὴρ οὐτως τὸ δέ ἐ ῥοθῇ

3. θ has been corrected from another letter or else the scribe’s pen slipped and made two strokes instead of one along the base. The γ seems to have been written twice, but no other letter can be read. If we may assume an error, Πινθακον might be read, in which case the opening words of 1.4 might belong to a quotation.

4. The supplements in this and the subsequent lines were for the most part suggested by Lobel. Ἀθναίοι (or possibly Ἀρτυκοί) may have stood in l. 8.

5. l. συναλλαφεῖσθαι. For συναλλαφεῖσθαι = to coalesce, of syllables (συναλλαφή is more frequently used than the verb), cf. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 1070 R.

536. LEXICON TO HOMER, ILIAD XIII.

Acquired in 1917. 6.6 x 11 cm. Third century.

Lower part of a leaf of a papyrus codex, written in the small sloping hand common in the third century. There are two narrow columns to each page separated by not more than 1 cm.; each column appears to have covered about 100 lines of the Homeric text and probably consisted of not less than 50 lines. The complete codex may well have contained a glossary to the whole of the Iliad. Other examples of this format, which got the maximum amount of writing into the available space, and which may have developed out of the economic necessities of the time, to be found in this volume are 529 and 549. The ink is faint and in parts the text has been rewritten. There are no accents, stops, or other signs.
These 'scholia minora' to Homer, as they are found in the papyri, have been studied by A. Calderini, *Aegyptus* ii. 303 sq., *Commenti Minori* al testo di Omero in Documenti Egiiziani. To the list of texts there given (some published for the first time) may be added P. Oslo 12 and P. Lit. Lond. 177. The conclusion to which Calderini comes, that the Egyptian texts stand in the closest relation to the *Scholia Minora sive Didymi*, (D) (the edition used here is that of Aldus, Venice, 1521), the Paraphrase of the Iliad (printed as an appendix to Bekker's *Scholia in Homeri Iliadem*, Leipzig, 1827) and, in a less degree, to the *Lexicon Homericum* of Apollonius Sophistes (ed. Bekker, Berlin, 1833), is amply confirmed by the present text.

The numbers in brackets refer to the lines of the Homeric text.

Recto.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col. i.</th>
<th>Col. ii.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verso.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col. i.</th>
<th>Col. ii.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A a
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1. Cf. τὴν ἁλείαν ὀγκώσεων ἐδόντας (Pa).


4. So Pa: perhaps θάνατος should be added after σφαῖρας.

9. Ὀψειθήρ ἢ τῷ διπλωματὶ τὸ γόνατος D; τὸ ὀξύων μέρος τοῦ γόνατος (Scholia Townleiana, ed. F. Maas, Oxford, 1878).

10. Or perhaps προ(ξ)θυμεῖτο, as Pa; ἔφθασε τιμῶν D.


15. Cf. the scholion to the Venetus Marcianus 433 (Dindorf, Homeri Ilias, Scholia, iv, s.v.): ἄπειλαι δὲ αἱ καυχήσεις.


18. So D (without καὶ φεύγεις).


20. So D, with φοβερῶς added.

22. άξιον καὶ καταμάντῳ άξιον D.

23. So D (ἰσόλεια) and Pa.

24-6. Glosses on all these three words are found in D.

28. τοῦ τῶν πόλεων ἠχυρωματὸς Θᾶλσατος D and Pa.

30. στυμοδόπορος Pa. This is too long for the available space in the papyrus. ἔδηγον or possibly ἐδοκοῦν might be read.

31. Although a large amount of the text—ll. 415–35—is covered in these three lines, the supplement in this line is probably correct; as in D (which is on the whole considerably fuller than the papyrus) there are only three glosses between that on τετράποτος and that on βόλας.

32-4. It is not clear to what these lines relate. Perhaps a line was interpolated in the text used by the commentator.

33-4. Perhaps a gloss on άδρας (530) or πῆλακα (527). In l. 34 ἀνατετράμενου might be read, cf. Ap. s.v. διάλωσις.

35. So Pa.


37. So Pa.

40. So D and Pa. In the next line τετράμενου cannot be read.

43. ὃ τῷ ἄλλῳ διαφθείρας ἔδαπνως D and Pa.

45. The letter before εἰσαγοράσ τοῦ is neither a μ rather than a ν, but it is hard to see what the word can be except νείρος; the gloss may have been on φλέβα (l. 546).

47. So Pa: ἐξερέε, ἐκείρε D.


49. τερεσταμενον D and Pa.

50. So Pa and D.

52. So Ap, D, and P.
537. WORD-LIST TO HOMER, Iliad V.

Acquired in 1917. Oxyrhynchus. 9 x 6 cm. Early fourth century.

Written on both sides of the papyrus in a heavy, upright hand common in documents of the early fourth century A.D. Verso precedes recto, but it seems unlikely that the sheet was part of a codex, as half of the verso has been left blank, and the arrangement of the lines on that side does not correspond to that on the recto. The glosses do not seem to be derived from any single extant collection of scholia on the Iliad; for their relation to the scholia in general see introduction to the preceding text. It is not improbable that the present text was a vocabulary designed for school use. For similar lists cf., e.g., P. Ryl. 25 and P. Lit. Lond. 177; as in the latter, the words and the glosses on them are sometimes separated by dots. The text on the verso relates to Iliad V 5-11, that on the recto to v. 37-53.

Verso.

[εναλιγκαίναν] :: ομοιόν
[παμφαίνησαν] :: λαμπρήν
[λελουμένως Όκεανοι
[ανατατό] ek ton Όκεανον
5 τούοιν] τοιούτον
[κλονοστό] :: ἐπαραστάτῳ
[ἱερεὺς] ἱερεὺς
[ησαρ] ησαρ
[μαθησ] εν εὐς] ὕπατε πασίς

Recto.

10 εκλιγναν] εδιο[ξαν]
ελε] ἀπεκτεινε
μεταφέρεναν] το μεταξύ ι[ων ομοιον]
αράβησε] ἐφοβήσε
εὐνρατο] ἀπεκτεινε

15 θηρήα] κυνῆγιας
θηρητηρα] κυνηγον
ιοχειρα] [το]ντοίχως

7. ἱερεὺς P.

3. The scholiasts on this line (cf. Dindorf, Homerii Ilias, Scholia, s.v.) usually explain the genitive with λείπει ἡ ἔρι. D explains: νεωρί ἀντικλαύει ἐξ ὅκεανοι (see Pa also).

6. κλενατο: ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπιλαεκτον Αρ; διεκτριάστον D and Pa.

1 A recent example is the text published by B. A. van Groningen in Mnemosyne, v (1937), pp. 62 sqq.
8. ἰδιῶν: ἱππα ὑμῶν D. It is interesting to find that the dual is glossed with ἱππα, since the dual forms are given in full in contemporary grammatical papyri, cf. 538, 534 above.

10. To the left of lines 10 and 11 are ink marks which suggest that this part of the papyrus may have been used before and was not thoroughly washed: this may be why these lines are inset.

12. μετάξιν (ἀνὰ μέσων) τῶν ὑμῶν Pa.

538. METROLOGICAL TABLE.

Acquired in 1917.  5.4 x 8.5 cm.  Second century.

Written along the fibres in a large and unpractised semi-uncial hand, such as is sometimes found in private letters. The writer was using a faulty pen and the ink has blotted in places. Table of the Roman money system with no variations from the norm, perhaps drawn up by a schoolboy. The verso is blank.

[....] ψ[....]
[....] ἑυστερία μ[....]
[....] α χρυσάν ξ α[....]
[τὸ δὲ] στροφέριον εἰς ἰππα[....]
5 [ρία αργυρα] κτ [οι χρω]
[σοῦ] εἰς ἰππαρία αρ[....]
[γυρα] κὲ τὸ δὲ αργυροῦν
[ἰππορίον εἰς τριπαία [β]
[τὸ δὲ] τριπαίον εἰς
10 [νομίμους δυο οὶ δοὺς]
[μοι εἰς ασφαλία δ ὀῳ[τε]
[ἐχεὶν τὸ στροφέριον]

3. 1. ἐχεῖ et passim.  8. τριπαία P, as in l. 9.
V. EXTANT GREEK AUTHORS

539. HOMER, ILIAD I.

Acquired in 1917. Frag. (b). 6·6 x 7 cm. Late second century B.C.

These fragments of a roll of Iliad I formed part of the same piece of cartonnage as the second-century papyrus of Deuteronomy (458); a description of the find and a discussion of the date of the texts, together with a photograph of frag. (e) of the text of Homer will be found in Two Biblical Papyri, pp. 11 sq. Frag. (a) of the Homer, the long strip containing the final letters of col. i, was folded round frag. (b) of the Deuteronomy. The text is one of considerable interest, and may definitely be placed in the ‘eccentric’ class; there are several unrecorded readings, and two lines, although in a fragmentary condition, are preserved, of which there is no trace elsewhere. It is generally accepted1 that the vulgate text of Homer first appeared in Egypt about the middle of the second century B.C., after which period the eccentric texts tend to disappear and the vulgate remains dominant; hence we might infer on this ground alone that a date for 539 later than that assigned to it here is improbable.

There are no stops or accents; a critical mark has been placed against 1. 116. The text has been collated with that of Allen (Homer’s Iliad, Oxford, 1931).

Frag. (a) + (b).

Col. i.

95 [υνὶ αὑτὸν δὴ γενόμενον καὶ ημῖν μαντὶς ἀφετέρῳ
[οὐκ ἀπὸ τῷ γενέσεις εἰς μετέριεται οὐθ ἐκατέρβηθι
[ἀλλὰ ἐνεκ ἀρπήμορος ὁ γενικὸς Ἀγαμήμων

[ὑπὸ ἀπελευθεροῦν θυγατρὶ καὶ οἶκον ἀπεδέχεται ἀποικα
[τῶν εἰς ἀργὸς ἐπικατέθηκαν εἰς ἐκεῖνος Ἀγαμήμων

100 [καὶ θελήσῃ
[ήτοι γὰρ ὑπὸ κατὰ τὸν οὐκ ἄνεψτη
[ὁροὺς ὡς Ἀτριέθης εἰρν κρεῖνον Ἀγαμήμων

[εἰς ἑκάστην μενήσεις [ἐν τῷ μέγας προσε ἀμβίῳ μελαζώναι]

[πεπλευντὶ οὐσε δὲ οἱ πρῷς λαμποτώντε] εἰκὴ[ν]

The text appears to be a fragment (Frag.) of ancient Greek literature. It is difficult to transcribe accurately without the context of the surrounding text. The text contains complex Greek words and phrases, indicating a high level of literacy and historical context. The content could be referring to a philosophical or literary discussion, given the use of terms like "εὐπροσφέρων" (euprosferon) and "αὐθεντέουσαν" (athenthousan). The references to "Αχαια" (Achaea) and "Πυθείδης" (Pitheides) suggest a connection to ancient Greek history or literature.

The text is a blend of scholarly notes and possible attempts at transcription or translation. The presence of abbreviations and the style of writing is consistent with ancient Greek manuscripts.

92. Probably this is the first line of the column, as the papyrus immediately above the final letters of this line is blank; if l. 91 preceded it, some traces should be visible, as it is equal in length to l. 92. If 92 is the first line of the column, there were only nineteen lines to the column.
539. HOMER, ILIAD I

97. There is nothing to show whether the papyrus in this line had the text given above or that read by Aristarchus: \( \text{ὅδε ὅ γε πῶς διαμετέχει λογοῦ ἀπόκειται.} \)

100. All the MSS. here read (αἰ subst. substituted for τοῖς by Zenodotus and the scholia) \( \text{ἔρχεσθι τὸ τέσσερα κέν μου} \) \( \text{καλουσάμενοι} \) \( \text{πεποιηθέναι,} \) nor is there a trace of a variant in any ancient authority.

106. \( \text{καὶ} \) \( \text{οὖν,} \) so Aristarchus and a few MSS.; the majority read \( \text{ἀλήθεια} \). Once again there is no trace of the variant preserved by the papyrus; though it may be no more than a reminiscence of I. 541 \( \text{αἰτεῖ} \) \( \text{τοι} \) \( \text{φιλού} \) 

110. All MSS. here read \( \text{οὐδὲ} \) \( \text{οἴδε} \) \( \text{οὐδὲ} \) \( \text{φιλοῦ} \) \( \text{μανεῖν} \) \( \text{συνεδρίους.} \) The line is athetized in some of the scholia, but no substitute or alternative version of it has survived. Instead of \( \text{ἡ} \) \( \text{ἀνθρώπους} \), \( \text{ἡ} \) \( \text{μάνα} \) might be read.

258. \( \text{δὲ περὶ μὲν} \) \( \text{βουλὴν} \) \( \text{Δαυὶδιν,} \) \( \text{περὶ} \) \( \text{δὲ} \) \( \text{κτῆσιν} \), so Allen's text, reading \( \text{βουλὴ} \) with Aristarchus, Herodian, and some of the MSS. and scholia; the majority read, with the papyrus, \( \text{βουλὴ} \). The transposition of \( \text{βουλὴ} \) and \( \text{Δαυὶδ} \) is peculiar to the papyrus.

261. \( \text{πρὸ} \) \( \text{MSS.:} \) \( \text{πω} \) \( \text{papyrus.} \)

540. HOMER, ILIAD II

Acquired in 1917.

Frag. (b). 7.5 x 11.2 cm.

First century.

Of this papyrus of \( \text{Iliad II} \) more extensive fragments, ranging from l. 251 to the end, have already been published by H. J. M. Milne as no. 6 in his \textit{Catalogue of Literary Papyri in the British Museum}. These additional fragments, all of which belong to columns in part already published by Milne, are none the less welcome since, besides adding to the text of the papyrus, they include the statement of the number of \( \text{στιχοὺς} \) at the conclusion of the poem and also give us, in conjunction with the London fragments, an almost complete text of the central portion of the prose introduction to the \textit{Iliad} which was written by the same scribe at the end of the book. In the computation of the number of verses in frag. (e) the archaic Attic notation is used, which is, according to Ohly's list (\textit{Stichometrische Untersuchungen}, Leipzig, 1928, p. 84), found only in three other papyri, two of Homer and one of Sappho; this is in itself of interest, since Ohly points out (\textit{loc. cit.}) that this system cannot have been used, even in Athens, later than the middle of the first century b.c. and had been obsolete elsewhere for a hundred years before that: consequently our MS. must derive (though not necessarily directly) from a MS. of some antiquity. Further, the figure given is 840 —there may be a few letters missing at the end of the line, but the number cannot have been higher than 849—whereas the number of lines in our MSS. is 877; consequently, the text of which this papyrus is a copy contained at least twenty-eight fewer lines than the normal. Enough verses were athetized in antiquity to account for this discrepancy; and the \( \text{Δ} \) found against l. 419 in one of the London fragments (see Milne, introduction) indicates that nineteen of these lines were omitted in the first half of the book. In the extant text of this papyrus, after l. 419, eleven lines are absent; so that we may infer that the number of verses in \( \text{540} \) was not more than 848 and was probably nearer 840.\footnote{The stichometry of this text, as known from the London fragments, was dismissed by Collart (\textit{op. cit.}, p. 57) as \textit{fantastique}, a judgement which, in view of the new evidence, appears too severe.}
The two new fragments of the prose introduction (both of which connect directly with the London fragments) confirm in several cases Milne’s conjectures, while ll. 27–35 become for the first time intelligible; where the new fragments necessitate a change in the reading of doubtful letters in the London fragments attention has been called to this in the notes. For the convenience of the reader the complete text of the introduction (in as far as it exists), including the London fragments, is given below; the supplements in ll. 1–27 are by Milne, except where noted, and also those in ll. 35–45. For another account, perhaps a school exercise, of the events preceding the story of the Iliad see P. Rain. Lit. I, xviii.

To the description of the MS. given by Milne it is unnecessary to add much. The verso of frag. (g) contains another piece of the document mentioned by Milne, which can now be exactly dated to the seventh year of Domitian (A.D. 88/89) and gives us a terminus ante quem for the Homeric text. At the end of the MS., i.e. in the margin of frag. (g), are traces of writing in a coarse cursive hand; these, taken with the similar scrawls on the London fragment (see Milne, p. 20) reveal themselves as Homeric phrases picked out at random—λγαμέρων, ἤρως ἀρείον, etc. The new fragments do not increase our respect either for the intelligence or the orthography of the scribe.

The London fragments were used by Allen for his text of the Iliad, with which the new fragments have been collated. A facsimile of part of the London text appeared in New Palaeographical Society, ii. 53. In the transcription below those parts of the London papyrus, either of the text or of the introduction, that directly connect with 540 are underlined.

Frag. (a).
Col. vi.

κατέστατος δ ὄροντα καθαρθέντες κατ’ ἀγας
κατεστάν τε κατὰ κλεισίας καὶ δείπνημ ελοντο

400 ἀλλος δ ἄλλος ἑφικέεθεθεν ἔθεν αἰεὶ γενεναγωγον
ἐνυγμωνος θάνάτου τε φθοράς καὶ μαλόν Ἀρρης

αὐτὰρ ὁ Βοῦν ἠρέσεν οὖν [αὐτῷ] Ἀγαμέμνον
πιθὺν πεντανήμορον ὑπερεῖρεν Κρονών

κυκλοσκεῖ δὲ γεροντας αἰσθήσας Παναχαίον

405 Ναστορα μὲν πρωτιστα καὶ νηροτομέην ἀνακτά
αὐτὰρ ἐπιτ Αιαστα δίσι καὶ Τενθοὔς ποιον

εκτόκατον δὲ οὖν Ξυστήρα Διὸ μητίν [αὐτάρκης]

410 αὐτοματος δὲ οἱ ἡλίθε [βρότην] αὐγῆν [αὐτὴς Μενελαὸς


Frag. (b).
Col. viii.

[σμεράλδοιοι κοναβηζε τῶν αὐτῶν τε καὶ ὑπτών]

[ἐστήκαν δ εν λειμώνι Ἐκαμανδρίων αὐθαυμάτων]

[μυρίωμεν οὐσία τε φυλή καὶ αὐθενα γεγένεται ὡρο]
540. HOMER, ILIAD II

[540] HOMER, ILIAD II

470 [ὁδ 'τε] κατά σταθμὸν σωματικῶν ἡλίασκοιοῦν
[οὕς εἰν εἰρενείας ὅτε τὸ γῆθαι αὔξης δὲνεῖ]
[τολμᾶτι οἰπ δεῖ τρωᾶσθαι καρή κομοιοῦσε Ἀχιλλῆς
[ἐν πεδίῳ οὐσιν τὴν διαμείνα ομαλὰς τεκναί]]
[του δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀπολογοῦν ἀνδρεῖς
[ὅπερ] διακρίνωσιν ἐπει δὲ νομί μηνεὸς τρᾷσιν'
[οὐ τοῖς ἡγέμονες διεκομμενον ἐνθέω καὶ ἐνθά
ουμενήν ἵνα μῆτα δὲ γλυκύκις Ἀθηνῆ
ομαστί] καὶ [κεφαλῆς ἐκεῖς τοὺς ἰπτερύκειρανοι]

471. I. εἴριψη. 475. I. διακρίνωσιν. 477. I. ὑστεροθ'.

Frag. (c).

Col. xiv.

οἷς δὲ ἄρα Νικήτου τ' εἰχὸν Κρατασθήν τ' Ἐλλήνον τε]
καὶ Ἐλλήνων πολιτῶν νησίων τε Καλλιδίνας
τῶν αὐτῶν Ἐλλήνως τε καὶ Ἀκτησίδος ἡγοῦσθ' Ἀθηνῆν
Θεσπεδοῦς καὶ δυὸς Πρακτείδα ἀπακτος

680 τῶν δὲ τρικοντάτα γλαδίαν[α] νεος εὐτυχοντο

ναν αὐτὸς συντο τὸ Πελασγίκον Ἀργος εὐλίκαν
οἰ τ' Ἀλών οἰ τ' Ἀλυκὴν εἰν τὰ Πρακτείδα εὐμοιοτο
οἱ τ' εἰχὸν Φθείων γῆ Αλλαδία [καθηλαγνοικια]
683 2 τῶν μεν Θησεώνιος δοξομελετος ἡγεμόνευεν'

Μυρίδωνες [δὲ] καλεντο [καὶ] Ἐλληνες [καὶ] Ἀχιλλῆς
685 τῶν αὐτῶν πενητῆκοντα νεον ὅς αρχος Ἀχιλλῆας

ἀλλὰ οι γ αὐ τοῦ πολεμοῦ δυστυχέος εμφανιτο
688 κεπτο γαρ ἐν τηγασι πεδαρχης δος Ἀχιλλῆας

κοινῆς καθιεμον Βραχίδος νυκτοίροι

682. Τρικοντατα γλαδιανα τοια πολλατοι: so also the MSS. (with the exception of φ̅), Strabo and

Eustathius. 683a = 657. This transposition is not found in any other MS. 687. Omitted. Lines

686–94 were athetized by Zenodotus.

Frag. (d).

Col. xix.

Μυρίδων εις Χρομίους ἔρχε καὶ [ἐνθομος οἰωνος]
αὐτῇ οὐκ οἰωνον εὐρυστὰτο κυρα μελαναν
860 αὐτῇ ἐδοχεῖν υπὸ χερσὶ ποδοκες Διακόδαο τεν
ἐν τοσομοι χρυσον δὲ Αἴλεος εκομιστε δαφροῖν

Φιρκυς αὐς Φρυγας ἔγα καὶ Αικανοῖς θεοὶ ἔδεισιν
EXTANT GREEK AUTHORS

865. ev: added from 861. 861. In our text this line has changed places with 875. 865. l. λύμη.

872. l. κούμη.

Frag. (e).
Col. xx.

ιΔΙΑΔΟΣ

Β

ΑΡΙΟΜΗ ΓΗΝΗΔΑΔΔΑ

Frag. (f) and (g)
Col. xxi.

tοῦτου τοῦ πολεμίου πρὸ [τῆς [Ἀχιλλεω
ς μυμβης] ταῦτα [ἀ[i...]] καθ' ὁμηροῦ της
θελήσας διγγυγοςδια τοὐτον τὸν τρ
οπὸ τὴν δαγγῆσιν πυρουμένος οὖ
κ αν ὁμορμαίοι της αὐλήθειας κατὰ
tους αυτοὺς [χρόνους ἱσταν επὶ] ὦ κ
ἐν τῆς Ἑρώτῃσι καθελὼν τοὺς καὶ
ἐν τῇ Δαρείας ῤεγαμένοις ἀλλοι δὲ
tὴς Ἀχαι[ας] ἀν ἐρωτευχόντοι οἱ Ατρεώ
ς ταῦτας τοῦ Πελοπόννησος τοῦ Ταυτα
οὐ τὸν Δαών Ἀγαμεμνῶν τε καὶ Με
ελαος οὗτοι το ταῦτα παρεκ[θῆναι]
καὶ Δ

875. 870. 865. 861. In our text this line has changed places with 875.
20 ἐκαθήσε ταῦτα εὐγενικαὶ γυναικὶ

25 εἰς Δακεδαμώνα τὸν δὲ Μενελαοῦ καὶ

30 ἀρραταῖος διὰ χρημάτων διὰ περιτομής μου πρῶτον μὲν επιλογίσας αὐτὴν

35 εἰς Ἀδηστοὺς οὖν ἐκάθ' ὁμορρηπ.:...κτεῖν

Col. xxii.

40 διαγνακτῷ[πρό]τεροι [ἐξ] τοῦ [αὐτοῦ]

45 στὴν εὐδοκῆς Πενθεσέλλ[ε]ια.
32. According to the common version, the union of Helen and Paris took place on the island of Kranae (Iliad iii. 445): according to one story, preserved (apart from this text) only in Strabo (iii. 1, 22), the island in question was one off the coast of Attica which after Helen's visit changed its name from Kranae to Helene (v. Roscher, Lexikon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie, i, 2, 1939).

33. έχουσαι for ανέκουσαι is an unusual error, but the sense of the passage is plain and the only alternative would be to read ανεκουσανας (which would suit the space better) and assume that the scribe wrote it in error for ανεκουσανας.

34. ανθεφε for ανθέφε is an unusual error, but the sense of the passage is plain and the only alternative would be to read ανθέφε (which would suit the space better) and assume that the scribe wrote it in error for ανθέφε.

35. The writer of this introduction clearly follows the story found in Proclus' epitome of the Cypria and often in later literature, according to which Helen and Paris went to Sidon (and, in some authorities, Egypt as well) before returning to Troy; Herodotus' version (ii. 117) is that they reached Troy in three days from Sparta (cf. Roscher, op. cit.).

37. Probably the last line of the column: in the Homeric text there are only thirty-five lines to the column.

38. ... so ... [Milne. According to Milne's numeration this is l. 37.

43. With this Milne compares Schol. Townley, II. xxiv. 804 ὅ τι ὀρθού ἄγαμον τόφων Ἑστορον ἠλθεὶ Ἀργος ἀνεύτορὸς μεγαλότερος ἀδροφόνῳ, and remarks that both versions are designed to link the Iliad with the Anthologies.

541. HOMER, ILIAD II.

Acquired in 1917. 11.7 x 26.3 cm. First century.

Part of two columns of a roll containing Iliad, Book II. The writing, along the fibres, is an upright, somewhat formal, and decorative hand, not unlike that of Schubart, Pal., Abb. 75, though not so stylized: σ has a curved top, ι is deep and reaches below the line, the medial stroke of ε is unattached to the rest of the letter and generally connects to the base of the following letter. There is no accentuation and only one certain case of punctuation; the apostrophe and diaeresis are occasionally used. The verso is blank. The text is that of the vulgate and there are few readings of any interest. Collated with Allen, Homer's Iliad.

Col. i.

| 400 | [αλλος δ' αλλῳ ερεθε θεων αμειγενεταινον |
| [ευγημενος θανατον τε φυγιων και µολον Αρης |
| [αυταρ ο βουν ιερωσεν αναξ ανδρων Αγαμεµνων |
| [πωνα πενταετηρον ιερεµενει Κρονιων |
| [κυκλοσκεν δ' ηερωνιαις άριστησις Παναγαλων |

408 [Νεπτορα µεν πρωτητα και θυμενην ανακτα |
[αυταρ επτιν Αιαντη] δ'ων και Τώδεος υπον |
[εκτων δ' αυτ Οδυσση Διο µητων αταλαντων |
[autómatos de ois ἠλιβάνθηθεν αὐγάνθος Μενέλαος

[ἥδε γε γαρ κατὰ θυμοῦ] ἀδελφεῖς νως επονεῖτο

[vais de περιστηρισμοὶ] καὶ υπόλιται ανελκτο

[τοις δὲ εὐκαμὼν] μετέφη κρειών Αγαμεμνών

[ἐκεῖ κυδιστε μεγαθής κηλιδιφής αἰθερίς ναιν]

[μη τριν ἐπὶ ἠλίον δύναι καὶ εἰπὶ κεφας ἐλθεῖν]

[τριν μὲ κατὰ πρῆγκα] βαλεῖν Πριμοῦ μελαθρῶν

[αυθαλεῖ πρηγαὶ δὲ] πυρὸς δήποιο θυρεῖρον

[Εκπροεὶ δὲ χιτώπα περὶ στήθεσι δαίδαι]

[χάλκο ρωγαλέου] πόλεις δ ἀμφ᾽ αὐτοῦ εἰ[αίρου]

[πρὶνες εἰ κονησίων οδὰς] Λαυζώτας γαῖαν

[οὐ επάτῳ οὐδ ἀρα ποίον επέθραμεν Κρηνίων]

[ἀλλ᾽ ὁ γε διέκατο μὲν ἢποιοῦ δ᾽ ἀμεγαρτὸν οὐ[βέλλεν]

[ἀνταρ εἰς β εὐχαστο καὶ ὁλομαχοῦσα αρχινήτῳ]

[αὐρωταν μὲν πρῶτα καὶ εὔψαξαν καὶ εὐκραῖν]

[μηροὺς τ᾽ εξεταμὼν κατὰ τὴν κυνη εκαλυψάν]

[διπτυχα πνευμάντες ὡς αὐτῖν καὶ ἀμφητήσαν]

[καὶ τὰ μὲν αρ σχεῖσθαι αφυλλοῦσαν κακτόμων]

[στυλαγχαὶ δ᾽ ἀρ αμπειραίτες] υπερεῖχος Ἡφάστοιο

[ἀνταρ εἰς κατὰ μηρ εκαὶ καὶ στυλαγχαῖς] πασαντο

[μουστάλλον τ᾽ ἀρὰ τάλλα καὶ αμφί] οβελοῦσιν εἴσιμαρην

[πετηραν τ᾽ ἐπεμφράδεως ἐρυσαντο τε πάντα]

[ἀνταρ εἰς πασαντο ποὺο] τετυκευτο τε ἴδικα

[δαιμόνιο οὐδὲ τὸ θύμοι εὐβέβεο δαιεάς ἐκσής]

[ἀνταρ εἰς ποσοῦ καὶ ἐδήσεσι εξ ἑρόν [εἱπο]

[τοῖς ὀρα μνὺνν ἤρχε Γερήνος επτοτά Νεστίωρ]

[Ἀρείδῃ κυδιστε αναξ ἀνδρῶν Αγαμεμνόν]

[μηρείς τὸν δῆθ οὐθε λεγὼμην μηδὲ εἰς δῆ[ρον]

[ομβαλλωμέθα] εργον ὁ δῆθ τὸς εὐφύελετε

[ἀλλ᾽ οὔ γε κήρυκες μεν Ἀχιάων ἀλλοκέφαλον]

[λαοὺς κηρυσσότες αγειροῦτοι κατὰ τούς]

[ἡμεῖς δ᾽ αἴθροι ὧδε κατὰ] στρατον εὐρών Ἀχιάων]

Col. ii.

[ἰὸμεν σφρα [κε θασσὸν εὔερομεν οξὺν Λρη]κ] νως εφαθ᾽ οὐδ [ἀπύθησεν αναξ ἀνδρῶν Αγαμεμνόν]

[αὐτοκα κηρύκεσσοι λυγυδόγγυσι κελεῦσε]

[κηρυσσένα δὲλεοντε καρη κοιμουσας Αχιάων]

[οι μὲν εκπρήσσον τοι δ᾽ ἡγεροῦτο μαλ εκα]}

[οἱ δ᾽ ἀμφ᾽ Αθρείστακα διοτρεφεῖσι βασιλεῖς]

[νβενννον κρο . [ ]

[αιγεética εὐρών αὐτῶν ἀθανατῆν τε]

[της εκατόν θυσίαν παγχρυσίτει ἑρεθοῦται]
EXTANT GREEK AUTHORS

450 συν τις παλαιοσούνα διευρύντο λαοί Αχαιών
οτρικονι [μεναι εν δε σθανοι άρετον εκαστοι]
καιρόνι αδήλωτον πολεμιζειν ηδε μαχεσθαι
τοις δι αθφού πολεμού γυμνων γενετ ηε νεεσθαι
εν ημιςι γλαυφησι φιλην εσ πατριδα γαιαι

455 ηπειρυ πυρ αίδηλου επιφλέγει άστετον υλην
ουρεοσ εν [κορυφής εκαθει δε τε φαινεται αιγη]
ως των έρχομενων απο χαλκου θεσπεσιουν
αιγην παμφανωσα δι αθφου ουρανον ιε
tοις δι [ως τ οριζοντ ππερφων εβηνα πολλα]

460 χρηνοι τη γερανον τη κικον δουλοχυδερων
Λοσω [εν λειμωνι Καυστριου αμφι πεθαι]
eιβα [και ειβα ποτωται αγαλλομενα ππεργασα]
κλαγγηδον προκαθιζοντων σπαραγει δε τε λειμων
ως των [εβηνα πολλα νεος απο και κλισιον]

465 εις πεδιον προχεινον Σκαμανδραν αυταρ υπο χθων
συμπαζοντο κοναβιζε πποδων αυτων τω και υπανω
εσται δ [εν λειμωνι Σκαμανδρων ανθεμωτε]
μυροι [οσσα τε φυλλα και αθεα γιγνεται άρη]
ηπε μενιαοι αυμων εβηνα πολλα]

470 αι τε κατα σταθμον ποιμηνον ηλασκονυν
ωρη ειν ειαριην ωτε τε γλαγος αγγεα δενει
τοσον επι Τρωεσι καρη κοπο δντες Αχαιοι

450. The scrawl at the top of this column probably has no relation to the text; it is most likely a memorandum of some kind and κορυφής α λύτρα ε might be read.
415. θέρατος: θέρατα codd. The reading of the papyrus is probably influenced by the μελαθρον of the preceding line.
421. ἀκελοότος: also read (cf. l. 410) by six minuscules, none of which is earlier than the thirteenth century; προβοδλουτο codd.
436. ἐγγυαλίζει: so most MSS.; ἐγγυαλίζει Aristarchus, Apollonius Rhodius, Aristophanes, ST p5 and some minuscules. The latter reading is commonly adopted by modern editors.
441. εφα: εφατ' codd.
446. For this line—θένοι κράμοτες, μετα δε γλασκάτει Ἄδηνη—no variants are recorded, and the reading of the papyrus may merely be due to the omission of the ω of κράμοτες. The mark in the margin probably indicates a corruption of some kind.

542. Homer, Iliad V.

Acquired in 1917.

Third century.

Part of a column containing ll. 473-95 of Iliad V. The hand, a good book-hand of the best Roman style, is small, firm and regular, and closely packed; the letters are rounded and are all much of the same size; the tail of the v reaches below the line and has a slight
leftwards curve; the central stroke of ω is straight and carried slightly above the line as in P. Ryl. 28. There are no accents or breathings. The text (collated with that of Allen) is the vulgate. The verso is blank.

[ϕες πολύ [ατέ[ρ] λαον πολιν εξεμεν ηδ' ετεκουρων]
[ούοις συ γαμβροσι πασιγινητοίς τε σουσι]
[των νυν ου τιν εγων ιδεων δυναμιν ουδε νοησαι]
[αλλ' καταπτησσουσι κυνει ως αμφι λεοντα]
[ημεις δε μαχομεθα οι περ τ ετεκουροι ενεμεν]
[και γαρ εγων ετεκουροι εων μαλια τυλιθεν νηκω]
[τηλων γιαρ δυκιν Εανθω επι δειψητη]
[ενθ αλοχων τε φλιγων ελευν και ριβητων ἴσων]
[καδ δε κτηματα πολλας τα τ εξεδεης ου κεπεινη]
[αλλα και ου μυκηνος στρων και μεξιον αυτω]
[αιδρι μαχησασθαι αιερα αυτοι τι μοι εινθαδε τιοι]
[ουσ κ νε φερον μυκηνοι η κεν αγνου]
[των δ εστηκας ατιρα ουδ ελλουν εξελευθες]
[λατονιν μεικεμεν και αμυνεμεγαν οιρεσι]
[μη των ως αμφιση λιουν αλλοτε παισγροι]
[αιδραι διαμενεσσων ελωρ και κυρια γενησθε]
[ου δε ταχειπονια ευ ναιμενη πολιν υμη]
[σου δε χειρ ταξεν απο τα μελει νυκτας τε [και ημαρ]
[αρχοναι λιτουμενω τηλεκλιτων τ ετεκουροι]
[νουλμητες εκεμεν χαλεπτηρ η αποθεσθαι ενεπη]
[ου συνταξα αικε εις εκπιγης και πεταλοβος]
[αυται δ ε τε ουχειν ουν τειχησων αλτο χομιαξ]
[τιλλων δ οξεια δουρα κατα στρατον ατειξ πανη]

474. συ P: σοι codd. The error probably arose from haplography: the scribe intended to write συν γαμβροι (so Allen).
475. εγων: the vulgate reading against εων of other MSS.
477. I διενερη.
481. τα ελθεται Allen. The MSS. mostly read τα', a few τα' or τα δ'.
491. I τηθεκελευω. The following τ is an error peculiar to this MS.
492. The majority of MSS. read with Π χαλεπην: the rest κρατερην (so Allen).

543. HOMER, Iliad XI.

Acquired in 1917. Oxyrhynchus. 21 x 21-4 cm. Third century.

Written across the fibres in a good book-hand of the broad sloping type (cf. e.g. P.Oxy. 1016). On the recto are traces, badly rubbed, of an account in a small cursive hand which may be attributed to the later second century; hence the Homer text, if written later, may
be placed near the turn of the century. The text, with two variations, is that of the
vulgate; accentuation is spasmodic, but punctuation fairly regular (for a misplaced point,
see l. 556). The reading σακος μεσον in l. 565 has been corrected in the margin in a small
cursive hand. To the right are traces of a second column; the initial letters of ll. 582-98
remain and a horizontal line has been drawn at the bottom of the column. Each column
contained 33 lines; a wide margin is left in between them, and the impression given by the
text as a whole is not that of a casually written or school text. Collated with Allen’s text.

[μυφ εθερν θουο αρμα μετα Τρωας] και Αχαιους
[στειβοτει νεκυας τε και ασπιδος αιματι δ αεων]
535 [νερθεν απος πεπαλακτο και αντυ γες αι περι διφρον]
[ας τυ αφ ιππειων οπλων ραβδωλργες ειθαλλον]
[αι τ οπ επιστογρον ο δε ειτο δυναι ομιλων]
[αιρομενω μηδει τε μεταλευειμον εν δε κυδῳμον]
[ηνε κακων Δαιαους μιννα δε Χαλετο διουροι]
540 [αιναρ ο των αλλων επεπολειτο στιχις αιδρον]
[εγχει τ αορι τε μεγαλαιοι τε χεριμαδιοισι]
[Αιαντος 8 αλεινα μαχην Τελαιμυμωνιδαο]
[Σενος δε πατηρ Δαιαθ ψηφιγους εν φοβον οψε]
545 [στη δε ταφων σπιθεν δε σακος βιαλλα [επιμβοουν]
[τρισκε δε παπτηνας εφ ομιλου θιρι θεικων]
[ευτροπαλιριμενος ολιγων γουν] γοινων αμειβων]
[ως δ αιθωνα λειστα βων απο] μεσσαλιου]
550 [εσπευατο κουνε τε και ανερες αγρηοιται]
[οι τε μιν ουκ εισοι βων εκ πιεαρ ελεοθαι]
[παννικοι εγκησουντες ο δε κρειων ερατεων]
[εθυς αλλ οι τι προσετε θαμες] γαρ ακοντες
[αινων αισασου βρασειαν απο χειρων]
[καιομεναι τε δεται τας τε τρεις εσυμενος περ]
555 [ηθευν δ απονουσων εβη τετηκοι θυμων]
[ως Αιας τοι τοι Γρωνιοιμενος ητορ.]
[ηνε πολλ αικων περι γαρ διε νηπιον Αξιους.]
[ως δο σονα παρ αρουραιαων ενεπισταται παιδας]
[ενηθης αυ δη πολλα περι ροζαλ αμφις εαγη]
560 [κειρει τ εισελθον βαθυ λημον] οι δε τε παιδες
[τυπτουσων ροταλωτι βη δε] τε νηπι] αυτων
[στυμισω τ εξηλασαι ευει τ εκηρεσσατο φορβης]
[ως τοι τοι Αιαντα μεγει] Τελαιωνων ιων
[Τρωες υπεθυμοι τελεκειτι τ επικουροι]
565 [τυπτουσων ξυστουσι σακος μεσον αιν επουτο] μεσον εαν
[Αιας δ αλλοτε μεν μεγησακετο θουριδος αλκης]

545. Βαλλ': this reading has no other authority. The MSS. read either βάλετ' or βάλειν.
550. πειαρ: so a few other MSS., for πιεαρ.
548. HOMER, ILIAD XI

563. ἡμη (sic): l. ἡμη.
564. τηλεκελευθέρω: so other MSS. The reading πολυπτέρω rests on Aristarchus and the scholia.
565. σιδός μέσων: this inversion is not found elsewhere.

544. HOMER, ILIAD XXIV.

Acquired in 1917. 3.8 x 10.6 cm. Early second century.

Written along the fibres in an angular, tall hand with a slight backwards slope; ε, ο, and σ are narrow, ν, π, and μ unusually broad. Probably to be assigned to the first half of the second century, cf. Schubart, Pap. Graec. Berol. 19 a, id., Pal., Abb. 35 (a document of A.D. 135). The fragment contains part of ll. 169–76; the lower margin measures 5.7 cm. The verso is blank.

[στύ δε παρα Πριαμόν Δαυς αγγελος ηδε προσηνάδα]

170 [τυθθεν φθιγξειμεν] τινω δε [τρωμο ελλαξε γνα]
[θαρει Δαρδανιδη Πριγμε φρεζεν μηδε τι τσρβει]
[ον μεν γερ τοι εγω κακην σοισμεν τοδ υκαρου]
[αλλ αγαθα φρονεουσα διος δε ηκε αγγελος εμι]
[ος σεν ανευθεν ειν αμμα κριθεται ηδ ελεαρει]

175 [λυσασθαι σ εκελεουσ Ολυμπιο[σ Εκτορα διον]
[διορα δ Αχιλλην φερεμεν τα κε θημασ υπη]

545. HOMER, ODYSSEY IX.

Acquired in 1917. 12.4 x 9 cm. Third century.

This papyrus was most probably a school text, which may account for its eccentric and sometimes corrupt readings, and for its peculiar form; it consists of the first halves only of ll. 122–50 of Odyssey IX. The text is written in two columns divided by a thick line down the centre: another runs down the outside edge of col. ii. A blank space has been left at the bottom of col. ii; hence this extract is probably complete as it stands. The purpose in writing the first halves of the lines is obscure, unless it was a lesson in the use of the caesura; but the quality of the text and of the handwriting (a heavy and clumsy book-hand) makes it fairly safe to assume that it was the work of a schoolboy. The text, in spite of occasional corruptions and obviously spurious variants, is of interest as showing what might happen to a school text; after l. 141, a line from Bk. xiii (104) has been interpolated, and before 130 is a line which does not appear in our MSS., and which I have been unable to trace elsewhere. The orthography is poor and there are no accents or punctuation. The verso is blank.

C C
122. Corrupt, probably for γεωποίας: MSS. read οὖν ἂρα πολυμηνι.
124. l. χρεμίει.
125. l. ἐκεῖ(τε).
128. No variant is noted to the ἀπετ' ἐν' ἀρθρόσων of the MSS.; it is difficult to see what the writer of this text had in mind. He may conceivably have written [Ἀ]κεμεν=Ἀμεν', although elsewhere he both spells and scans the word correctly.
133. l. ἀφέων. εἰς [ἢ, ἐκεῖ] Ἡ: ἐκεῖ codd.
137. αὐκυροβολεῖσ [ἢ, ἐκεῖ ἀκυροβολεῖσ] codd. ἀγκυροβολεῖσ, a gloss (or perhaps a desperate effort on the part of a schoolboy who had forgotten the text), is only cited in Liddell and Scott (new ed.) from Hippocrates, πέρι ἀδειτοφεύς, 18.
139. ἐφορμησῆς Ρ: ἐπορμήσῃ codd.
141. In the MSS. this line runs κρήνη ὑπὸ στελοῦν· πέρι δ' ἄλγερον πεφέλασων; there is no authority for ἐκ κρήνης.
142 a = xiii. 104.
142. l. κατεπλημένη.
143. νῦντα δ' ὄφραινι codd.
144. l. γραφ. After γραφοί all MSS. read βαθεῖ.'
148. l. εἰσαίσμεν.
149. l. νοσί.

546. HOMER, ODYSSEY XXIV.

Acquired in 1917. 22.8 x 12 cm. Second century.

Written along the fibres in a large clear but clumsy uncial, very probably the work of a schoolboy. The hand, in general appearance closely resembles Schubart, Pal., Abb. 76, of the reign of Augustus; but ξ is formed by three separate and parallel strokes and μ resembles a double λ. Verso blank. Collated with the text of Ludwig.
546. **HOMER, ODYSSEY XXIV**

[κτήματα κειροινίας καὶ αγίαζοντες ακοινών]

460 [αὐτοὶ πλεονεχόντος τοῦ δ ὀνειτὶ φαίνεται] [καὶ νῦν ὅπε ἐγέρσοντο πλεονεκρέοντοι μοι ὡς αὔγοραν] [μὴ ὑμεν μὴ ὑμένας τοῖς εὐπορίαστοι κακοὶ εὐρήκατε] [ὡς εἴπατε οἱ δ' ἀρείμεζαν μεγάλων αλαλητῶν] [ημείσαις πλαυών γιοι τοῖς αὐθαίρετι] [μεναν]

465 [οὐ γὰρ σφιν ἀκόινος εἰς φρεσκὸν ἀλλὰ ἑσπερίδει] [πεθαίνοντες ἀμφὰ ἢ ἐσπῆλαν κατὰ τοῦτον] [καὶ τὰ χρονόν περὶ σφιν νωρίτερα χαλκοῦ] [ἀπορροήν ἡγερεθοῦσιν πρὸ ἀστείως εὐρυχοροῦ] [τοῖς δὲ ἑσπερίδεις γηγοιοτο ὑπημένη]

470 [φή δ' ο γε τιμεσθῆναι ὑπόεις φονοὶ οὐδὲ ἐμελίειν] [ὡς ἀποστηθέναι] [ἀλλὰ] [ἀπὸ] [τοῖς ἐπὶ] [μεν] [ποιμὸν ἐφεφευ] [ἀπὸ] [Ἀθηναία] [Σικε] [Κρονιώνο] [προσφῆδα]

464. τοι τ ἀθροαὶ: τοι δ' ἄθροας κοδὶ. μεῖναι, 80 FPHMU, h s v: μέραν LW, Eust., wh.

468. The mark at the end of this line may be for punctuation; but blots elsewhere in the text suggest that it is accidental.

471. εφεσείω, so M with most MSS.: ἐφέσειν LW.

---

547. **EURIPIDES, PHOENISSAE.**

Acquired in 1917. Oxyrhynchus. 7.3 x 10 cm. Later second century.

Plane 9.

Part of a column, containing ll. 646–57 of the Phoenissae, and belonging to the same roll as P. Oxy. 224 (now P. Lit. Lond. 76) which preserves ll. 1017–43 and 1064–71. For a description of the MS. see P. Lit. Lond. 76; for the reasons why this MS. is now dated somewhat earlier than it was in the introduction to P. Oxy. 224, see introduction to P. Oxy. 661. The text was not of a very high quality: in two places it shares the errors of other MSS. and also supplies an additional two of its own: it has been collated with the Oxford edition of Murray.

νοτίς [περίκεται γνας]

Δύρκας [χλασμοφοροῦμεν]

καὶ βαθὺς [παραφοράς γνας]

Βρομιοῦν [ἐνθά τεκτόν]

650 ματάρ Δοῖς γαμοῦσιν

κυσσοῦν [ἐν [περαστήριος]

ελεκτοῦ εὐθὺς ἐν θερόφοι]

χλασμόροις [ἐπὶ ἑρεσία]

καὶ κατασκήνωσιν ἀλβιστας ἐφισίεσιν]
548. THUCYDIDES II.

Acquired in 1917. Third century.  

5 x 7 cm. Third century.

Part of the right-hand side of a leaf of a papyrus codex, containing part of chapters 3 and 4 of the second book of Thucydides. This small fragment belongs to the same codex and is actually part of the same sheet as P. Genève 2 (published by J. Nicole in 1908), as is clear from the photograph of the latter. It consists of the right-hand part of the second column of one page (the verso) and the left-hand side of the first column of the next page (the recto), thus coming in between fragments (a) and (b) of the Geneva text. Nicole supposed that there were three columns, each of 32 lines, to a page; but as no column can have intervened between verso and recto of our text, and as room must be found for some 38 lines between the end of the verso and the beginning of the recto, we must conclude that, instead of each page having three columns with 32 lines each, there were two columns to the page, each of 48, or perhaps 50 lines (for a similar arrangement, cf. 529 above). So the codex, instead of having its pages broader than they were high—a format of which I know no example, except for the grammatical table, 534—was of a more normal type; excluding the margins, the measurements would be circa 15 x 26 cm.

The hand is of the sloping type common in the third century (but hardly in the second, as Nicole suggests). The end of a sentence in l. 5 is marked by a high point; the beginning of the parenthesis in l. 18 by a middle point. A paragraphus has been inserted below l. 19 to mark the end of a section; in our editions the break is made after ἀπὸκλαίνοντο in l. 21, where the papyrus punctuates. The only reading of interest is the correction διπο for δειν in l. 22, which is not elsewhere recorded.

This text has been collated by Mr. J. E. Powell for his new edition of the Oxford text of Thucydides, and is referred to, together with the Geneva fragment, as ΠIV; I am indebted to him for some comments on the text.

Verso.

[Συνεχεῖς κα τας ὀδοὺς καθίστατα]  
[μενουν ιητε τειχονεὺς ην κα[λ]α]  
[ταλλε νερον χ[ί]ν] ἐκαστον[η]
548. THUCYDIDES II

[εφαινε το] προς τα παροντα
5 [ζυμφορον εστάθαι επει]
[δι οι εκ] των δυνατων
[ετούμα ην] φυλακαντες ε
[τι νυκτα και αυτο το περι]
[ορθρον εξωρογεν εκ των οικη]
10 [ον ες αυτους αστως μη και]
[τα φως θαρσαλεσθεροι ου]
[σι προσφερωντο και] σφεση [ερ]
[εκ του ιστον γιγανται] αλλ [ερ]

Recto.

[ο;] [δε κατα πυλας ερημους γν]
15 να[κος δουσης τελευτ]
λαθ[οντες και διακοφαιτες]
των μοκιν[ν] [εξηλθον ου]
πολλοι: αυστηθησις χαρ ταχαι]
α επεγενεστο αλλοι δε αλλη
20 [της πολεως σηποραδες απαι]]
λιμπο· το δε τελευτον και]
πιο
οσον μαλι[τα ην ξυνεστραι]
μενον εσ[πετουσιν ες οι]
κημα μεγα ο ην του τε]
25 [χους και [α εθηραι ανεαγμε]
ναι [ετηχων αυτου οιομε]
νοι [πυλας τας θυρας του]

6. This line with only 16 letters is unusually short and Powell suggests (though the reading is not otherwise known) that the papyrus may have read ττηθη δε.
8. The papyrus does not support Ross’s correction of και to καρ‘.
16. Whether και was omitted (its deletion was suggested by Herwerden) or not cannot be established, as the line may have contained either 19 or 22 letters.
17. l. μοχ’[ε]ρ; the confusion between κ and χ is rare.
22. oηρ, to which oηω has been corrected, is a new variant and in itself is an equally likely reading.

549. XENOphon, CYROPAEDIA VII, ii.

Acquired in 1917. 7·3 x 8·8 cm. Third century.

In 1934, G. Manteuffel described in the Charisteria Gustavo Przychocki, pp. 108 sq., some fragments of a papyrus codex of Xenophon acquired in the Fayûm in 1932 and now
preserved in the University of Warsaw, which were later published by him (with a plate) as P. Varsov. 1; that the Rylands fragment belongs to the same codex may be regarded as certain, since not only are the hands of the two MSS. to all appearance identical, but the lines are of nearly the same average length, and the estimated size of the page almost the same (I had reckoned with a page 21.5 cm. in height and 13 cm. in width, while Manteuffel’s estimate was 20 × 13.5 cm.; the difference in the calculation of height is explained by the fact that more of the margin survives in the Rylands fragment). The coincidence is of some interest since the Warsaw fragments contain passages from Books i, iv, and v, and 549 from Book vii; hence we can assume that the codex included the entire *Cyropaedia.* This gives some support to the rather doubtful reading of the numerals scrawled in badly faded ink by a second and coarser hand at the head of the columns of 549, since a codex containing the whole of the *Cyropaedia* with 32–35 lines to the page (see Manteuffel, *Charisteria,* p. 111) would consist of about 300 pages, and Book vii would start, on that calculation, near page 225, and the numeration of the pages of the Rylands fragment is 234 and 235. It may be noted that this is a codex of unusual size for the third century (cf. the list of papyrus codices given in C. H. Roberts, *An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel,* pp. 32–3). The hand, as already described by Manteuffel, is of the small sloping type and may be assigned to the third century. Pauses are marked by small *paragraphi* and by points (ll. 11 and 24); an apostrophe may be noticed in l. 22 and a rough breathing in l. 19.

There are not many readings of interest in the portion preserved; but, unlike other papyri of the *Cyropaedia* (see P. Oxy. 2101 introd.), 549 does not give unwavering support to the DF recension, although it is perhaps nearer to this than to any other. Agreements of some importance with the HAG recension may be noticed in ll. 19 and 21 and an hitherto unrecorded reading in l. 15. For collation the Oxford text of Marchant has been used.

### σλδ Verso.

§ 6, § 7

γνωρ κραττων εντιχχη ὄκονοματες παντα οι Χαλ]

δανι εδεισαν τε και ἵκε(ενον πανασσαθαι ὀργιζομε]

ννον και) τα χρηματα απ(αινυ αποδοσεν εφασαν]

ο δ επε[ν [ο]ν ευθεα αντιν δευτο αλλ ει με εφη βου]

5 λειτθε πανασαθαι αχθομε(νον αποδεπε παιναι ουα ε]

λαβετε τοις διαφυλαξασι την ακραν ἡν γαρ αυθων]

ται οι ἀλλοι στρατιωται ὅπι [πλεονεκτουσιν οι ενα]

§ 8

κτω γενομαι[ι] παντα μοι καλως εξει οι μεν δη]

Χαλδαιων ουτως εποιησαν ὡς εκελευσιν ο Κυρος]

10 και ελαβον οι πεθομε[ι]ν πολλα και παντοια χρημα]

τα' ο δε Κυρος καταστρατουπεδευσας τους εαυτον οποι]

[εδοκ[ει] επιτηδευσατων εναι της σολεως μενεν επι]

[τους οπλους παρηγγειλε και αριστοποιεσθαι]

1 In the Rylands fragment the lines are packed rather more closely; but such variations are to be expected (cf. the Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, face. III, supplement, p. ix), especially in the second part of the codex. The fact that the lines in 549 tend to be slightly longer may be explained on the same grounds.
§ 12 Καὶ ἄκροκομην δὲ σοι αὐτῆς τοιῶν ἡ μην παρὰ ἔκολον

§ 13 Ἐν Σάρδεσιν τὴν γυρὰ ταύτα άκοντωστὶ ώδε [οὺς ἥδονες]
[sοι παν ο τι εστών ενθάδε] καλοῦν κτίμα αὐθαίρη γνωσὶ
[kι και ομοιος εἰς νεοτή] τολλων καὶ καλῶν παλιν
[sοι πλήρους η τοις (εσταί) η] δε διαπαθής καὶ άτι τεχναί]

§ 14 [σοιτα εξετασί δε σοι ιδοντα τα ἐλθοντα [εγι και περι]
[τη αρμαγηθ βουλευσασθαι] προτον δ’ εφη επί των ε[μοι]
[μους θησαυρος πεμπτε κεὶ παράλαμβανετ᾽] λοβον οι
[sοι φυλάκες πορα των εμι] φυλακων ταυτα μεν
[δη συμπουντεν ουκ επιμενετεν ο Κυρος ποιεθα] [υσπερ]

§ 15 [ελεξεν ο Κρούσιος ταδε δειμω εφη παινων ο Κρουσε]

1. κρείσσων HAG.
2. τε ομ. DF.
3. All MSS. here read χρηματα πάντα, except DF which omit the πάντα. In the papyrus we can hardly read χρηματα ασπόδωσειν, as that would result in a line of only 30 letters, whereas the average is 39. DF’s omission of πάντα may have arisen more easily, if the MS. from which they descend read ἄσωστα.
4. το επιμελείσατον CAGH. εύαι is omitted by CAEGH and έστι by HAG. As it stands, our text with 43 letters is rather long and the έστι may well have been omitted.
5. ίε γεναις.
6. ιε CAGH.
7. η, ομ. DF: καὶ ολιγοί MSS.
8. The length of the line makes it practically certain that έστιν was omitted, with HAG; by DF it is placed after πληροι.
9. τα, ομ. Μ̄SS.
10. δὲ Μ̄SS.
11. δὲ CAGH.
12. η, ομ. DF: καὶ ολιγοί MSS.
13. From the length of the gap it must have been present in our text.
14. η, ομ. DF. θησαυρον is the reading of all MSS., the earliest of which, H, is of the twelfth century, and it is interesting to find it supported by an early witness. Editors follow Dindorf in restoring παραλαμβανόντων.
15. οποια CAEGH (corr.): πάντα H (pr.) and DF. συνεπεσεν ο Κυρος ποιειν, so DF: συνέπεσε ποιεῖν δ Κύρος other MSS.
16. εφη ποιεως, ομ. DF: πάντως εφη other MSS.

550. [DEMOSTHENES], Kατὰ Θεοκρίνου.

Acquired in 1920. 8.4 x 17 cm. Second century. PLATE 8.

This is the first time that this speech, mistakenly placed in the Demosthenic corpus, has appeared in the papyri. The attack on Demosthenes in §§42–4 leaves no doubt that he
was not the author and, according to the hypothesis of Libanius, many in antiquity attributed it to Dinarchus; that it should appear at this period in Egypt perhaps suggests that it had already usurped a place among Demosthenes' speeches.

The present fragment contains part of two columns written along the fibres in a good book-hand of the second century, and early rather than late in the century. The columns were narrow and contained (to judge from the amount of text missing between col. i and col. ii) 28 lines each. The end of a sentence is marked by a high point in l. 13 and the end of a clause by a low point in l. 17; a paragraphus was placed under the line at the end of a section. The lower margin measures 5 cm.: the height of the roll would have been c. 25 cm. The verso is blank.

Col. i.

... [vo]

μεξων δειν τους
μεν αλλους τους οφει
[ἀριστας μπθενος με
[τῆχαι των κοινων]
5 [αυτον δε κρειττω
[τ]ων νομων ειναι:
φησι τοιν τουν παπ
πον ουτι αυτον ειναι
[τ]ων εν [του] γραμμα
10 [τ]ησιων γεγραμμενον]
και περι τουτον πολ
[λ]αν ερει λογους ως
[ε]κενως εστιν' εγα δε
[to] μεν ακριβες οπτετε]
15 [ρος εστιν ουκ εχω λε]
[γειν ει δ ον εστιν]
[ως ουτος ερει . πολι δι]
[κισσωτερον ειναι νο

Col. ii.

[μιξω καταψηφισαν]
20 [θα]ι υμεις αυτον ει ταν

30 κε[ιν ου καλως εχει]
35 ται[α της Σκιρωμον]

20. The papyrus agrees with the majority of MSS. in reading ταυ[δ] (or ταυ[α]) against the τοιθ' of D.
21. This line is on a level with l. 5 in col. i.
35. With S and D, the papyrus omitted ψηφισμα after Σκιρωμον.
36. προσελθων codd. That the papyrus had this reading is highly unlikely, as not only would it make the previous line too long, but would also involve a false division.
This is the first fragment of the Κατά Δεωκράτους (the author’s only extant oration) to appear among the papyri. It is unfortunate that such an early witness to a none too sound text (cf. Blass’s introduction to the Teubner ed.) should not include any of the more disputed passages; a new reading may be noticed in l. 3. The text is written along the fibres in a rather large, but delicate book-hand; lines and letters are well spaced and there is a slight slope to the right. It may be regarded as the precursor of the broad third-century sloping type as seen in P. Oxy. 23, and dated perhaps near the close of the second century.

1. This line, with 22 letters, is longer than any other; that the text differed from that of the codd. is unlikely.

3. αποδόσθαι codd. Probably αποδόσθαι not αποδόθαι should be supplied, although the latter suits the space slightly better, since, though ἀποδόθαι is found in Attic with a middle sense, it is not so used by the orators.

9. It is a little doubtful whether ἰδιόκεφαλος should be read here: the last visible letter has a small hook to the right and resembles a γ rather than an i.

1 A fragment (P. Berol. 11748) of the lost Κατά Μεσσαρίχων was published by W. Crüner in the Nachrichten der Göttingen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, 1922, pp. 45-6.
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I. NEW THEOLOGICAL TEXTS (GREEK)

(The Biblical quotations in 469 are not included)

469: 1-20

1 Where the line number is in square brackets, the word in question has been supplied.
II. NEW LATIN TEXTS

ad 477. 52 margin.
adsciscere 473. 29.
Afer 473. 12.
afficere 472. 21.
algosus 473. 8.
alienus 474. 10.
alius 473. 31; 477. 62 margin.
almus 472. 23.
altercar 477. 45.
amittere 473. 16.
an 473. 26 (?) , 28.
anima 472. 33.
appellatio 474. 18, 19.
appe[ 480. 4.
aqua 472. 12.
armare 473. 5.
ascensus 472. 118.
aspector 472. 19 (see note).
aspicere 472. 15.
assentiri 474. 10.
audire 472. 43.
aut 473. 7, 34.
aute 474. 1.
Balarus 473. 29.
barba 473. 36.
bellum 473. 37.
benedictio 472. 19.
Caecilius 477. 5.
caelum 472. 17.
caligo 472. 36.
Celtibericus 473. 37.
Cen[ 472. 12 (?).
clarus 472. 35 (?).
commodare 474. 7.
communis 477. 13 margin.
considerare 472. 34.
constituere 474. 4 (?), 5 (?).
contractus 472. 13.
corripere 473. 16.
Corpus 473. 30.
credere 474. 13.
crimen 477. 13 margin.
culpa 474. 15 (?).
cultrus 473. 36.
cum 474. 4; 477. 44.
cumulare 476. 39.
Daedalus 473. 42.
dare 474. 15.
de 473. [25]; 474. [7], 8.
debere (debitum) 474. 1, 2.
dextera 472. 16.
def[ 476. 39.
dicere 474. 14; 477. 9 margin.
dies 472. 11.
diu 473. 9.
dolor 473. 4.
dominus 472. 21, 39.
dulcis 472. 1.
dure 476. 16.
edecere 474. 8.
edo 473. 7, 34.
autem 474. 1.
Balarus 473. 29.
barba 473. 36.
bellum 473. 37.
benedictio 472. 19.
Caecilius 477. 5.
caelum 472. 17.
caligo 472. 36.
Celtibericus 473. 37.
Cen[ 472. 12 (?).
clarus 472. 35 (?).
commodare 474. 7.
communis 477. 13 margin.
considerare 472. 34.
constituere 474. 4 (?), 5 (?).
contractus 472. 13.
corripere 473. 16.
Corpus 473. 30.
credere 474. 13.
crimen 477. 13 margin.
culpa 474. 15 (?).
cultrus 473. 36.
cum 474. 4; 477. 44.
cumulare 476. 39.
Daedalus 473. 42.
dare 474. 15.
de 473. [25]; 474. [7], 8.
debere (debitum) 474. 1, 2.
dextera 472. 16.
def[ 476. 39.
dicere 474. 14; 477. 9 margin.
dies 472. 11.
diu 473. 9.
dolor 473. 4.
dominus 472. 21, 39.
dulcis 472. 1.
dure 476. 16.
edecere 474. 8.
edo 473. 7, 34.
autem 474. 1.
Balarus 473. 29.
barba 473. 36.
bellum 473. 37.
benedictio 472. 19.
Caecilius 477. 5.
caelum 472. 17.
caligo 472. 36.
Celtibericus 473. 37.
Cen[ 472. 12 (?).
clarus 472. 35 (?).
commodare 474. 7.
communis 477. 13 margin.
considerare 472. 34.
constituere 474. 4 (?), 5 (?).
contractus 472. 13.
corripere 473. 16.
Corpus 473. 30.
credere 474. 13.
crimen 477. 13 margin.
culpa 474. 15 (?).
cultrus 473. 36.
cum 474. 4; 477. 44.
cumulare 476. 39.
Daedalus 473. 42.
dare 474. 15.
de 473. [35]; 474. [7], 8.
debere (debitum) 474. 1, 2.
dextera 472. 16.
def[ 476. 39.
dicere 474. 14; 477. 9 margin.
dies 472. 11.
diu 473. 9.
dolor 473. 4.
dominus 472. 21, 39.
dulcis 472. 1.
dure 476. 16.
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III. NEW CLASSICAL TEXTS

(including Greek words in the Latin texts and new readings among the fragments of extant authors)
NEW CLASSICAL TEXTS

III.

407. 10, 16; 489. 42, 50, 77, 109; 493. 112.

'Αμυντίαιναι 501. 5.

'Αμύνωσε 478. 49; 493. 89, 92, 154.

'Ανοιχτά 464. 3 (?).

'Αποκρίσης 477. 9.

'Απειρίας 428. 5 margin; 491. 40. 'Αντί τοῦ 475. 4.

'Απεπιείκειτο 492. 9.

3. 18; 487. 83; 487. 4.

'Απεργείων 493. 39, 40.

'Απεργώσαν 489. 30.

'Απεργήθησαν 475. 5 (?).

'Απεργήθησαν 489. 111.

'Απεργήθησαν 478. 67.

'Απεργήθησαν 489. 86.

'Απεργήθησαν 490. 7, 21.

'Απεργήθησαν 489. 42.

'Απεπεργήθησαν 501. 9.

'Απεπεργήθησαν 477. 9 margin.

'Απεπεργήθησαν 478. 1, 4, 138; 452. 12; 486. 5; 487. 36; 489. 99; 491. 13, 18; 493. 113, 118; 540. xxii. 33.

'Απετέκασαν 492. 30.

'Απετεκάσαν 475. 12 (?).

'Απετεκάσαν 490. 59; 491. 39.

'Απετεκάσαν 478. 47.

'Απετεκάσαν 489. 94.

'Απετεκάσαν 490. 15.

'Αργός 482. [19].

'Αργύριος 531. 8 (?).

'Αργυροί 504. 10.

'Αργυρίου 487. 8.

'Αργυρών 478. 37.

'Αργύρως 490. 73 (?).

'Αρχάγγελος 480. 71, 75.

'Αρχόν 494. 4.

'Αρχόν 489. 113; 490. [9].

'Αρχόν 476. 42; 478. 109; 493. 112.

'Αρχόν 490. 9, 12, 45.

'Αρκαδός 478. 133.

'Αρκάκες 483. 81.

'Αρκάσις 483. 102.

'Αρκάσις 488. 6.

'Αρκάς 483. 10.

'Αρκας 490. 40.

'Αρκαχρόφυτος 478. 151.

'Αρά 488. 49, 91, 125. 'Αρά oύν 493. 125.

'Αράτης 490. [7].

'Αρμάτης 478. 85.
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καθαιρέω 489. 158.
καθαρός 487. 30.
καθεστάται 489. 177. 73.
κάθθος 494. 3.
καλό μή 504. 12.
Κακάλεο 477. 5 margin.
καίπερ 510. v. 8.
κακές 489. 101; 489. 110. κάκωστος
493. 44.
κακοτήτα 487. 28, 35.
κακοί 476. 11; 489. 36.
κακῆς 493. 78; 498. 10.
καλλανά 510. v. 3.
καλλύς 478. 95.
καλῶς 475. 10, 19 margin; 477. (29).
Κάλπι 501. 10.
καρδία 468. 5.
καρπάρια 506. 8.
καρποί 491. 14, 23.
κατά 497. 27; 489. 71; 483. 35; 501. xxl. 29; 545. 143.
καταβαίνων 492. 26 (?); 493. 42.
καταγγέλλω 477. (13).
κατάδεξιαν 540. xxii. 28.
κατανιβάω 489. 115.
κατανιβάων 498. 3.
καταράμεν 491. 19.
κατακεκλείδω 478. 9c (?).
κατάλογος 489. 117.
καταμφίβολος 477. (5), (8), (16), (19), (22).
καταμφίβολος 477. (11).
καταλιπέω 489. 103.
καταρρέω 478. 124.
κατασχέω 493. 31; 504. 6.
κατασχέω 487. 30.
κατέχω 478. 8.
κατηγορίας 477. (27), (30).
κατηγορίας 479. 59 (?).
κατηγορίας 479. 79 (?).
κάτω 493. 53.
κεφάλαιον 475. 17 margin.
κεφάλαιον 429. 11.
κεφάλαια 476. 5; 492. 69.
κεφάλαια 489. 43, 67.
κεφάλαιον 477. 67 margin; 489. 66.
κεφάλει 497. 10.
Κέφαλή 497. 4.
κλάπτειν 477. 12 margin.
κλέπτα 482. 2.
κλέπτειν 477. (21); 493. 22.
III. NEW CLASSICAL TEXTS
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302. 2 (?); 508. 5 (?).
1, 277. (1); 501. 4.
431. 19.
510. v. 7.
482. [4].
478. 140.
475. 22; 476. 26 (?).
840. 32; 35.
477. 27.
491. 20.
477. 33 margin.
475. 16 margin.
477. (23); 483. 5.
498. 9.
314. 5.
478. 54.
478. 49.
475. 24.
478. 127.
478. [141].
507. 13.
476. [65].
483. 6.
490. 25.
490. 20.
491. 45.
478. 11.
478. 45; 477. (24), (31), 61 margin; 478. 10, 60; 482. [6], [13], 14, 18, 21, 24, 26, 28; 489. 66, 69, 100; 500. 3; 513. 3.
477. (12), (24).
477. (13), (25).
505. 17, 18.
510. v. 10.
493. 43.
493. 90.
493. 113.
488. 4; 498. [124].
482. 6.
490. 62.
490. 29.
498. [6].
483. 17 (?).
493. 125.
478. 14, 158.
478. 13, 20.
483. 15; 487. 25; 491. 13.
487. 30; 489. 47.
478. 5; 477. (27).
477. (48).
450. xxii, 24.
475. 18 margin.
474. 10 margin.
484. 8.
483. 138.
512. 2 (?).
487. 36; 489. 62, 103; 490. 25.
459. 63.
497. 9 (?).
493. 157.
484. 17 (?).
486. 3.
478. [72]; [101]; 132; 489. 107.
478. 66 (?).
19 margin; 489. 105; 490. 57.
478. 22.
25, 26.
57.
478. 128.
13.
487. 29.
489. 16. 10.
478. 128.
489. 81, 114, 118; 490. 23; 493. 112.
492. 9.
128.
478. 57.
489. 10.
493. 37.
479. 7 (?); 476. 37; 477. (3).
482. 13; 489. 37.
490. 112.
492. 9.
478. 128.
478. 57.
488. 9.
478. 20.
478. 11.
478. 71.
482. 8.
489. 109.
488. 18, 20.
489. 106.
489. 104.
508. 2.
478. 13.
487. 25.
492. 32.
478. 31.
478. 34.
477. (24); 488. 6, 24 (?).
477. 5 margin.
483. 7.
490. 100.
486. 2.
487. 19; 482. 9; 489. 24 (?).
487. 14; 492. 64, 67.
478. 59; 490. 72.
482. 14.
489. 36, 65, 93; 492. 46.
30; 497. 92.
509. 3.
IV. SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL TEXTS

(a) Astronomical, Mathematical, and Astrological

1 Excluding the Ptolemy, 522, and the astronomical tables, 523 and 529.
V. SELECT LIST OF SUBJECTS DISCUSSED
(The numbers in this and the subsequent index refer to pages)

INDICES

Heliodorus, 159.
Hippocrates, Aphorisms of, 162.
Homer, eccentric texts of, 181.
Hymn to Apollo, 51.
Iliad, prose introduction to, 183 sq.
India, 154-157.
initial letters, enlargement of in Latin texts, 72, 84 n. 85, 86.
Lapidus, rebellion of, 57.
Lysander, 105, 109 n. 115.
Manichees in Egypt, Manichaism, 39 sqq.
Marathon, battle of, 118, 119.
Menander, 96.
metrical treatise, fragment of, 132.
Monophysite heresy, 21.
nomina sacra, perhaps unabbreviated, 1, 3.
— unusual forms of, 17 n. 8, 27 n. 4.
34, 35 n. 23.
nomenclature of columns, 137 n. 1.
Parchment rolls, 16 n. 1.
Persia, events in, 340 B.C., 114 n. 71.
Persian Wars, text dealing with, 118-119.
Philistus, 132.
Phoebus, 132.
Plato, 96.
Polybius, account of Second Punic War, 115.
— contemporary MS. of(?), 116, 132.
Pseudo-Asconius, 73, 76 n. 2.
Ptolemy, Manual Tables of, 142, 147 sq.
quantity, marks of in Latin texts, 72, 78.
red ink, use of, 53 n. 7, 144, 149, 151, 153.
refrain in early hymnology, 29.
reparatio tempora, discussion of, 70.
roll, height of, 110.
Rome and Egypt in the second century B.C., 116, 132.
St. John Damascene, hymns of, 20 sq.
St. Theodore Stratelates, xiv, 32, 35 n. 35, 2.
Sardinia, early history of, 56, 62 n. 36.
Scholia Minor to Homer, 177.
Scholica Synaitica, the, 66, 68, 69, 70.
Segesta and Athens, 132.
Seleucid history, fragment dealing with, 133.
Scrapion of Thmus, 40 n. 7.
Sertorius, adventures of in 61 B.C., 58.
Sophocles, 92.
Sosylius, 116.
stichometry, Attic notation in, 183.
word, use of by Gnostics, 18, 23 n. 4.
Telephus, story of, 91 sq.
Theodosius of Alexandria, 170.
— Canons of, 170-1, 173, 175.
Theopompus, 110.
Theopompus Comicius, 168.
Ulpian, Ad Edictum of, 64.
Vettius Valens, 154.
Virgil, translations of into Greek, 79.
Virgin Mary, prayers to, 46.
word-division in papyri, 99.
y, use of in Latin text, 84 n. 27.

VI. SELECT LIST OF PASSAGES DISCUSSED

AUTHORS, COLLECTED WORKS, ETC.

Aesop (Teubner ed.):
I. 90, 105, 106 . . 120, 127 n. 103.
no. 160 . . 127 n. 75.
no. 175 . . 136 n. 19.
Anthologia Graeca Carm.
Christ. (Christ-Paranikras), pp. 227-8 . . . . 30.
Augustine, De Civ. Dei, xxii.
39, 5 . . . . . . 55.

Book of the Secrets of Enoch
Callimachus, Diog. 71. x . 97.
— VII. 19 . . 97, 98.
1 Corinthians x. 33 . . 45 n. 35.
Corpus Juris Romani Anti-
fuithianus, ii, p. 44 . . 39-40.

108 . . . . . . 50.
— p. 65 . . . . . . 55.
Digest XII, 1, 1 . . 63, 64.
Eusebius, H. E. v. 25 . . . . . . 39.
Exuperantius 3, 26 . . . . . . 57.
Galen vii, 443 . . . . . . 166.

Abbreviations in Latin papyri, 63.
65 n. 15, 66 n. 21, 68 n. 3.
Accentuation in Latin papyri, 73.
Aegospotami, battle of, 105.
amulets, use of the Psalms for, 13, 16.
— use of liturgical texts for, 25, 47.
Anaximenes of Lampsacus, 110.
Andreas of Crete, 29.
Apices in Latin texts, 56, 78.
Babrius, 120.
Canon, development of, 39.
Chaeronea, battle of, 110, sqq.
Chi Rho symbol, 120.
Coptic, Christian works in, 99.
Cosmas of Maiuma,
Cross of the Virgin, 110.
Dio of Alexandria, 39.
Dio of Athens, 39.
Diodorus, 56.
Eritrean Psalter, 42.
Eryximachus and the Socratic circle, 104 sqq.
Euhemerus, 147 sqq.
Edict of Diocletian against the Manichees, 132.
Euphrasian liturgical texts, 144, 149.
Eupolemus, 172, 173.
Eustathius, 120.
Festal Letters, 38-9.
Gnostics, Gnosticism, 18 sqq., 45 n. 34-5.

This is a section from a scholarly work discussing various subjects including abbreviations, accentuation, amulets, apices, and a list of passages discussed. The text is structured in a manner typical of historical or literary analysis, with references to various texts and authors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/Organization</th>
<th>Passage/Work</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hebrews xiii. 4</td>
<td>n. 16</td>
<td>44 n. 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippocrates:</td>
<td>Aph. v. 7</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. 9</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. 16-17</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. 19</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. 24-22</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vi. 16</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mul. 2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>109 n. 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isocrates</td>
<td>xvi. 18, 19</td>
<td>109 n. 115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah iii. 9</td>
<td>n. 18</td>
<td>41, 44 n. 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinian, Nov. 17a, 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livy xxx. 38</td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke xxiv. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lysias. xxvi</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migne, P. G. i. 1461-71</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oribasius</td>
<td>49, 30, 18</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovid, Heroides</td>
<td>17, 18</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pausanias</td>
<td>x. 17, 5</td>
<td>62 n. 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pistis Sophia</td>
<td>I. 36 (57)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II. 72 (161)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II. 105</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV. 132 (342)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato</td>
<td>Theet. 214 sq.</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plutarch, Vita Serveti</td>
<td>5 sq.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salust:</td>
<td>Jug. 31</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hist. I. 83</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II. 7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II. 114</td>
<td>63 n. 33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servius, ad Aen. ix. 437</td>
<td>72, 77 n. 53</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophocles, Frag. 784 (Pearson)</td>
<td>94 n. 10-11</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabo, III. 2, 22</td>
<td>188 n. 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thucydides, VI. 46</td>
<td>132, 135</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papyri</td>
<td>BKT. V. 2, p. 64</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Galbiati, Accum. I, pp. 49-70</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenyon</td>
<td>JHS. xxix, pp. 30 sq. 170</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milne, JEA. xv (1929), pp. 75 sq.</td>
<td>103 sq.</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Genève</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Grenf. II. 84</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Lit. Lond. 6</td>
<td>182 sq.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Lond. Christ. I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>78 sq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Oxy. 224</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>454</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>668</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Rain. Lit. I. xviii</td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Ross-Georg. I. 10</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Ryl. I. 19</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>58, 58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. S. I. 756</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Varsov. 1</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, JEA xxi (1935), pp. 159 sq.</td>
<td>56, 86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, Two Biblical Papyri</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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